

possible curtail the importation of refined sugar made in tropical islands, and thereby protect the jobs of American men and women of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6392. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of W. C. Russell and 60 other merchants of the First Congressional District of Kansas, urging the passage of the Patman chain-store tax bill and thereby prevent monopoly, conserve our resources, promote business within the State, increase employment, and restore prosperity to the citizens of our county who support and maintain its institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6393. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the College Point New Deal Democratic Club, New York, opposing aid to Finland or any other nation in Europe at war, as these moneys could be put to much better use right here in our own country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6394. Also, resolution of the board of supervisors of the county of Chemung, N. Y., urging the adoption of the so-called Harrington amendment to the Lea bill; and opposing any enactment of any railroad consolidation bill which would result in any hardships by reducing railroad personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6395. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Ajax Athletic Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Federal legislation which will either eliminate the importation of refined sugar from tropical areas or, at least, safeguard the present jobs of home sugar-refinery workers through quotas, tariffs, or both; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6396. Also, petition of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., concerning House bill 944, wool-labeling legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6397. Also, petition of the Employees' Committee to Maintain Brooklyn's Cane Sugar Refining Industry, concerning pending sugar legislation before the House committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6398. Also, petition of the Social Democratic Federation of New York City, with reference to the Wagner-Steagall housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6399. Also, petition of the Sportsmen's Council Marine District of New York State, favoring the Mundt antipollution bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6400. Also, petition of the State of New York Banking Department, New York City, concerning pending legislation which would expand the powers of the Federal home-loan bank system and Federal savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6401. Also, petition of the Nurses Association of the Counties of Long Island, Inc., concerning pending sugar legislation which will eliminate the importation of refined sugar from tropical areas or safeguard the present jobs of home sugar-refinery workers through quota, tariffs, or both; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6402. Also, petition of the New York State Sewage Works Association, favoring legislation and aid in stream-pollution abatement; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6403. Also, petition of the New York State Waterways Association, concerning the conference report on Senate bill 2009; to the Committee to Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6404. Also, petition of the Izaak Walton League of America, Brooklyn Chapter, concerning the Mundt antipollution bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1940

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., pastor of the Covenant First Presbyterian Church, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Two men went up into the temple to pray, the one a Pharisee and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and

prayed thus with himself, "God, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are—extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week. I give tithes of all that I possess."

And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, "God be merciful unto me, a sinner."

On this Ash Wednesday let us look to Him in prayer.

Father of all mercies, grant unto us, Thy servants here assembled, the spirit of this publican, who realized that the surest and shortest pathway to Thy presence was the way of humility and repentance. We stand here to discharge this accustomed formality, but on such a day as this, when believers throughout the world turn thoughts of penitence to Thee, may there be deep and sincere searchings of each one of our hearts, that through Thy redeeming mercies our sins may be forgiven. For who amongst us has not erred against Thy holy laws?

Open Thou our eyes that we may see clearly the evil that is in this troubled world through sin, and awaken all our citizens to godly sorrow for whatever share we may have had in bringing the peoples of the earth to this troubled state, either through the things we may have done or the things we may have left undone.

Deliver this people from the secret power and open shame of national sins; from all dishonesty and political corruption; from all self-glorification and shameless extravagance; from thoughtless speeches and irresponsible opinions, that stir up wrath and envy and hatred either at home or abroad. Turn us again, O God, that we may be saved. Deliver us and our children and save us in this land which Thou hast blessed with the light and liberty of pure religion. Through Jesus Christ, our only King and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 6, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Andrews	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Ashurst	George	Lundeen	Snathers
Austin	Gerry	McCarran	Smith
Bailey	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Barbour	Glass	McNary	Taft
Barkley	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Minton	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Byrnes	Hayden	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Danaher	King	Reynolds	Wiley
Davis	La Follette	Russell	
Donahay	Lee	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Dowell, of Iowa.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are detained on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR DENEEN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of announcing the death of the Honorable Charles S. Deneen, former Governor of Illinois and United States Senator from Illinois from 1925 to 1931.

Had Senator Deneen lived until May 4 he would have reached the age of 77 years. And it is significant to note that until 2 weeks ago, when he was stricken with a cold, he was actively engaged in his chosen profession of the law, as well as participating in the preprimary discussions of the Republican Party in our State.

Charles S. Deneen was endowed with a personality in the widest sense of the word. He enjoyed good health. He was physically strong. He possessed an even temperament. He was an intelligent and educated man. With all these fine mental and physical attributes he was destined to be a success in life.

He will best be remembered by the citizens of Illinois because of his high and noble character. Friend and foe respected him. The fact that he has been the real leader of the Republican Party in Illinois for a period of 50 years is ample testimony of the strength of that character and the high esteem in which he was held by his fellow men.

He had a great mind and a great heart, and his passing is a loss to us all.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to amend section 26 (e) of the act of February 23, 1931, as amended by the act of April 24, 1939, the purpose of which is to insert additional language which has been found, in administering the aforesaid section 26 (e) as now established, to be necessary in order to carry out fully the purposes of this law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1940.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

REPORT ON THE STABILIZATION FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939, including a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1939, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RETIREMENT, ETC., OF OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard," approved January 12, 1938, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Negro Labor Assembly of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of pending antilynching legislation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress to provide a method by which the counties in the State of Mississippi may be reimbursed by the Federal Government for losses of revenue due to Government-owned lands having been with-

drawn from tax liability. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD under the rule and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

House concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide a way by which the counties of this State may be reimbursed by the Federal Government for losses of revenue because of Government-owned lands having been withdrawn from tax liability

Whereas during the past few years the United States Government has acquired title to many thousands of acres of land in Mississippi, and now holds the title and possession thereof exempt from all State and county taxation; and

Whereas the removal of these lands from tax liability has worked a hardship on several counties of this State and some equitable arrangement should be perfected whereby the Federal Government would be authorized and empowered to reimburse the several counties according to their several losses by reason thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein). That we do hereby petition the President and the Congress of the United States to provide a way and method whereby the counties of this State may be reimbursed by the Federal Government to the extent of their losses occasioned by the withdrawal from tax liability of all lands therein now held and owned by the United States Government, exclusive of public buildings and the land on which the same are situated; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 31, 1940.

(Signed) SAMUEL E. LUMPKIN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate February 2, 1940.

(Signed) DENNIS MURPHREE,

President of the Senate.

REGULATION OF THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point resolutions adopted by the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, Kans., and also a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Wichita Chapter of the American Petroleum Institute, all voicing opposition to the enactment of H. R. 7372, and opposing any similar proposals to place the petroleum industry under Federal regulation.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to state my own opposition, on behalf of the people of the State of Kansas, to this type of legislation. There are certain matters which, in my judgment, fall into the sphere of Federal regulation, but the regulation of a private industry, such as the production of petroleum, does not, I think, fall into that category.

The conservation of petroleum supplies is, I believe, a matter of public interest; but such conservation programs should be handled by the States themselves until such time as they have plainly demonstrated that they are not equal to the task. There is no need for going beyond State regulation at this time, and I hope the time when we will have to call upon the Federal Government to take over the duties and responsibilities of the States in this field shall never come.

In the past few years the oil-producing States, including Kansas, have proved their capacity and their ability to handle this conservation problem. So long as this condition obtains, I regard any proposal to take from the States the power to regulate and turn it over to the Federal Government as a serious infringement upon the rights of the States and the liberties of the people.

Government should be kept as close as possible to the people themselves. This measure, upon which hearings are now being held before a subcommittee of another branch of the National Legislature, proposes to place this phase of government as far from the people as possible—in Washington. The fact that the Governors of nine of the oil-producing States believe it of such vital importance that they have appeared, or will appear, before the House subcommittee in opposition to this measure is an indication of the feeling of the people of those States which the Congress should not disregard.

I shall have more to say upon this subject if any such proposed legislation ever reaches the floor of the Senate. For the present, I merely desire to register my opposition to any

proposed legislation which seeks to provide Federal regulation of the petroleum industry and to ask that the resolutions I have mentioned may be printed following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from Kansas will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions are as follows:

KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Topeka, Kans., February 3, 1940.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a resolution to which we would appreciate your attention. It relates to the Cole bill, H. R. 7372, which proposes the creation of a Federal oil authority. When we realize that the value of oil and gas production at the well in Kansas, even under rigid proration, plus lease and royalty payments, is ordinarily as much as the value of the State wheat crop at the farm, we are alarmed by anything which may disturb it.

Again, even if the resource involved were unimportant, or of small value, we feel that where there is an established State authority which is carrying the responsibility involved the Federal Government should be cautious in taking any steps. Generally speaking, the country suffers more from State evasion of responsibilities than from Federal invasion of States' rights. Where the majority of the affected States have assumed their responsibilities, as is the case in respect to conservation of oil and gas, the Federal Government should concern itself with devising means by which the few States that have failed to accept their responsibilities might be induced to do so, rather than concern itself with overlapping those States which are discharging their responsibilities.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL WILSON.

Resolution of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce to the Oil Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Whereas H. R. 7372 proposes to authorize the creation of a Federal commissioner within the Department of the Interior to supervise and regulate the production of crude petroleum and natural gas within the several States; and

Whereas the State of Kansas, a major oil-producing State, has enacted and enforced adequate conservation laws since 1931 through a State agency which is experienced and capable in such matters; and

Whereas the broad power to engage in undertakings for the promotion of the general welfare is inherent in the States, while it is limited in the Federal Government to that which is effected by the power to tax; and

Whereas the States, through exercise of the power to prevent avoidable waste of irreplaceable natural resources, have regulated the production of petroleum and have thereby promoted the general welfare and prosperity of their citizens; and

Whereas an extension of Federal power to the control of production of petroleum would establish precedent for Federal usurpation of all powers of the several States in respect to all basic commodities, since all important commodities flow in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the enactment of H. R. 7372 would constitute an unreasonable, unnecessary, and unjustifiable duplication of functions of the Federal and State Governments, and such a policy would endanger and destroy the progress which has been attained under State control and would be detrimental to the welfare and prosperity of the people of Kansas: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce (which has a membership representative of all classes of business and a majority of the local chambers of commerce of the State), That we hereby express our opposition to this type of legislation, or to any other form of Federal control, and express our confidence in the integrity and efficiency of the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas as an agency for dealing with the problems involved.

KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
SAMUEL WILSON, Secretary.

JANUARY 26, 1940.

Whereas the Wichita Chapter of the American Petroleum Institute is fully aware of the great importance to the people of the United States of the petroleum resources of this country; and

Whereas the Wichita Chapter of the American Petroleum Institute earnestly believes that the American system of free enterprise is indispensable to the continuance in this country of the American form of government; and

Whereas the American petroleum industry in the past, without the payment to it of subsidies of any kind, has met all demands made upon it in times of war as well as peace, and in recent years has developed vast underground reserves which will enable the industry to meet all demands that may be made upon it for many years in the future, either in emergencies or peace times; and

Whereas all of the important oil-producing States in this country, with two exceptions, have already adopted conservation laws, and efforts are now being made by representatives of the industry in these two States to enact conservation laws in said States; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this body that House bill 7372 would result in transferring to a subordinate bureau of the Department of the Interior of the Federal Government, headed by an administrator with dictatorial power, control in the minutest degree of the production and transportation activities of the industry, which would soon affect all branches of the industry and seriously interfere with and impair the progress made by the conservation departments of the many States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wichita Chapter of the American Petroleum Institute make this formal protest against the passage of House bill 7372 or legislation of a similar nature; be it further

Resolved, That the Wichita Chapter of the American Petroleum Institute make this further formal declaration: That it favors the enactment of conservation laws in all of the important oil-producing States in this country.

Resolutions of the Board of Directors of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce, Wichita, Kans.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the petroleum industry has by its own enterprise, with the cooperation of the State governments, improved its methods of production, refining, and transportation, and has constantly diminished the amount of preventable waste, thus enabling it to more fully meet all regular and emergency demands made upon it in peace or in war; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the petroleum industry in the Wichita area that H. R. 7372 would obstruct rather than aid the cause of conservation, in that the regulation and control of the production and transportation activities of the oil industry by a bureau of the Federal Government would complicate and duplicate present supervision by the State regulatory agencies (which naturally have closer contact with and better understanding of the problems involved) and would create conflicts of authority and jurisdiction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce in regular meeting assembled, That it oppose the passage of H. R. 7372 as being contrary to the best interests of the Nation, the States, the consuming public, and the petroleum industry.

Done at Wichita, Kans., this 17th day of January 1940.

WICHITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
J. WARD GALE, President.
G. W. BOOTH, General Manager.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2991. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States certain lands in the city of National City, Calif. (Rept. No. 1183); and

S. 2993. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and acceptance by gift of certain lands from the city of San Diego, Calif. (Rept. No. 1184).

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 212) for an investigation of campaign expenditures of Presidential, Vice Presidential, and senatorial candidates in 1940 (submitted by Mr. GEORGE on January 10, 1940), reported it without additional amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY, pursuant to law, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, 11 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by The Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BORAH

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 223 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 223, submitted by Mr. CLARK of Idaho on February 1, 1940, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. William E. Borah, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PROPOSED LOAN TO FINLAND

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this morning the Committee on Foreign Relations ordered a report on the bill recently referred to it from the Banking and Currency Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized, during any adjournment or recess of the Senate, to report the action of the committee today in ordering a favorable report on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, am I to understand that action was taken by the Foreign Relations Committee today?

Mr. BARKLEY. It was.

Mr. McNARY. And is it likely that the bill will be reported during the session of today?

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be reported today; but, if it should not be so reported, I desire the privilege of having it reported during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the request. If we are to take action in the matter it should be done without further delay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PITTMAN subsequently, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 3069) to provide for certain loans to the Republic of Finland by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, reported it with an amendment to the amendment heretofore reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and submitted a report (No. 1185) thereon.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which may be proposed tomorrow when the Finnish-loan bill comes before the Senate. I ask that it be printed in the Record today as part of my remarks for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, after line 22, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to make loans to the Republic of Finland in an aggregate amount not to exceed the amount paid by such Republic on account of its obligations to the Government of the United States. Such loans shall be made for the purpose of enabling the Republic of Finland to finance the purchase of such articles and materials as it deems necessary, whether or not such articles and materials are the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States or any of its Territories or possessions, and all such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Federal Loan Administrator shall prescribe. The Secretary of the Treasury shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the amount of all loans made under this section to the Republic of Finland."

Mr. BROWN. I also ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BROWN. I also ask that a letter from the Treasury Department setting forth the present status of the indebtedness of the Finnish Government to the American Government, and the present status of the indebtedness of the Russian Government to the American Government, be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 22, 1940.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your telephone inquiry of Mr. A. F. O'Donnell, Division of Research and Statistics of this Department, requesting information in regard to the indebtedness of the Governments of Finland and Russia to the United States Government.

The indebtedness of Finland arose from obligations received by the American Relief Administration for relief supplies furnished under an act of Congress approved February 25, 1919. The principal amount of such obligations was \$8,281,926.17 and they originally bore interest at the rate of 5 percent. This rate was reduced to 4½ percent to December 15, 1922, under the funding agreement referred to below. The original obligations matured June 30, 1921.

An agreement for funding the indebtedness of Finland to the United States was entered into under date of May 1, 1923. Au-

thorization to settle the indebtedness of the Republic of Finland to the United States as agreed upon was contained in an act of Congress approved March 12, 1924. Under the funding agreement the principal of the debt was to be paid in annual installments due December 15 each year over a 62-year period ending in 1984. Interest was made payable semiannually on unpaid balances on December 15 and June 15 of each year. The rate was 3 percent per annum from December 15, 1922, to December 15, 1932, and 3½ percent thereafter. A statement of amounts payable to the United States each year under the funding agreement is contained on page 126 of the enclosed copy of the combined annual reports of the World War Foreign Debt Commission. The combined annual reports also contain other information in regard to the Finnish debt which may be of interest.

Up to the fiscal year 1932 Finland regularly met the principal and interest on its debt as it came due under the funding agreement. Payments due during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932, aggregating \$312,295, including principal and interest, were postponed under the moratorium agreement of May 23, 1932, entered into pursuant to Public Resolution No. 5 approved December 23, 1931, authorizing such agreements with the various foreign governments indebted to the United States. The amount postponed, together with interest thereon at the rate of 4 percent per annum from July 1, 1933, was made payable by Finland in 10 equal annuities of \$38,061, each payable in equal semiannual installments on December 15 and June 15 of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1934.

Since the fiscal year 1933 the Government of Finland has regularly paid installments of principal, together with interest due under its debt-funding agreement and moratorium agreement. In other words, Finland is fully up to date with respect to amounts which have become due and payable under its debt agreements. A statement follows showing the original amount of the debt, the debt as funded, accruals of interest, payments of principal and interest, and the unpaid balance at the present time.

Original amount of indebtedness	\$8,281,926.17
Interest accrued prior to funding	\$1,027,389.10
Less interest paid prior to funding	309,315.27
	718,073.83
Total of debt as funded	9,000,000.00
Repayments of principal after date of funding	957,533.23
Present principal of debt	8,042,466.77
Accrued interest since date of funding	\$4,724,866.71
Less interest paid since date of funding	4,624,443.27
	(a) 100,423.44

Indebtedness at present time 8,142,890.21

(a) Represents interest postponed under moratorium agreement and not yet due under such agreement.

The indebtedness of Russia to the United States arose from three sources, as follows:

Principal of Russian debt:	
Advances under Liberty Bond Acts	\$187,729,750.00
Surplus supplies sold on credit under an act of July 9, 1918	406,082.30
Relief supplies furnished on credit under an act of Feb. 25, 1919	4,465,465.07
	192,601,297.37
Interest due to Dec. 15, 1939	\$211,141,106.97
Less payments applied to interest	8,750,311.88
	202,390,795.09

Amount of indebtedness Dec. 15, 1939 394,992,092.46

Repayments credited to the Russian debt represent the proceeds of liquidation of financial affairs of the Russian Government in this country. After the fall of the provisional government in November 1917, the Department of State and the Treasury entered into arrangements with the Russian Ambassador with a view to having assets of the Russian Government in this country applied toward payment of debts to American manufacturers, contractors, and the United States Government. Copies of letter dated May 23, 1922, from the Secretary of State and reply of the Secretary of the Treasury dated June 2, 1922, in regard to loans to the Russian Government and liquidation of affairs of the latter in this country appear in the combined annual reports of the World War Foreign Debt Commission as exhibit 2, page 84.

For your further information in regard to the war debts, there are also enclosed a memorandum covering the indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States, revised March 1, 1939; a statement showing the total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States, December 15, 1939; a statement showing total payments received on account of indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States as of December 15, 1939; and pages 68 to 72 from the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1939, with regard to obligations of foreign governments.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,

Under Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 6, 1940, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 323. An act for the relief of E. C. Beaver; and
S. 766. An act for the relief of the Missoula Brewing Co.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3283. A bill to extend to closed building and loan associations and for the liquidation of assets of such associations the same assistance that is now extended to closed banks and for the liquidation of their assets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 3284. A bill to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a new district in the State of Georgia, to be known as the north central district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the veterans of the United States when they borrow money from the Government on their insurance policies have to pay 5 percent interest. That money costs the Government from 1 percent down. The bill I am now introducing provides that hereafter the rate charged by the Government to the veterans shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3285. A bill to provide a maximum interest rate of 3 percent on loans secured by United States Government life insurance policies; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3286. A bill for the relief of Oscar C. Olson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 3287. A bill to convey certain lands to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 3288. A bill for the relief of William T. J. Ryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MINTON:

S. 3289. A bill granting a pension to Willis Snow (with an accompanying paper);

S. 3290. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Myrtle Snow (with an accompanying paper);

S. 3291. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth L. Jones (with an accompanying paper);

S. 3292. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Alleda Handrick (with an accompanying paper);

S. 3293. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Mary McCarty (with accompanying papers);

S. 3294. A bill granting a pension to Dorris K. Fitch (with accompanying papers);

S. 3295. A bill granting a pension to Gracie D. Maxey; and

S. 3296. A bill granting a pension to Isabel H. Maxey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3297. A bill granting a pension to Mary H. Stiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 3298. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Calder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 3299. A bill for the relief of Jephtha John Arbaugh; and
S. 3300. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. J. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3301. A bill for the relief of William Edward Boileau; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3302. A bill granting a pension to Rebecca E. Skaggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE:

S. 3303. A bill for the relief of James L. Kinney;

S. 3304. A bill for the relief of J. Frank Kuner, private, Uniformed Force, United States Secret Service;

S. 3305. A bill for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior;

S. 3306. A bill for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior;

S. 3307. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Barnard, Charles A. Stephens, Donald W. Prairie, and dependents of Vern A. Needles," approved July 15, 1939;

S. 3308. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General to settle and adjust the claim of Robert E. Newton;

S. 3309. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of O'Brien Bros., Inc., New York City, N. Y.; and

S. 3310. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., and W. C. Cole; to the Committee on Claims.

RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1162, to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, be recommitted to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let the request be restated. I did not hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida desires the recommitment of a bill, the title of which will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 157, Senate bill 1162, to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the matter has been emphasized, I desire to explain that the bill relates to certain allowances for those who were engaged upon the Isthmus in the actual construction of the Panama Canal. The bill is on the Senate Calendar with a favorable report from the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals. I desire to have the bill recommitted to the committee for the purpose of enabling it to consider certain amendments. Knowing the interest of the Senator from Oregon in the bill, I appreciate his inquiring about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none.

AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BARBOUR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7922, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 70, lines 8 and 9, to strike out "and for construction of a dam near Lenoir City, Tenn.," and on page 70, line 20, to strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$39,000,000."

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. The request calls for a brief word of explanation.

Since the organization of the Senate of the United States there have been approximately 130 contested-election cases. A first edition of these cases was compiled in 1885, and covered all cases prior to that date. A second edition was compiled which covered all cases from 1885 to 1893. A third edition covered all cases from 1893 to 1903. A fourth edition—which also included all previous compilations—covered all cases from 1903 to 1913.

Twenty-six contested-election cases have been before this body since 1913, and none of those cases have been compiled. It is of the utmost importance that the cases be carefully compiled and preserved for the guidance of Members of the future sessions of the Senate. It will be recalled that of the

26 cases that have occurred since the last compilation, 25 occurred since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, providing for the direct election of Senators.

Therefore, following all the precedents and the usual procedure, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 229) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections is hereby authorized to have compiled and printed for the use of the Senate a new edition of the work on Senate election cases, bringing the same down to the present Congress.

ELIZABETH COSBY YOUNGER

Mr. GLASS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Elizabeth Cosby Younger, widow of Thomas L. Younger, late custodian of the Senate Office Building, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 227, submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on yesterday, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is requested to submit the following information to the Senate at its earliest convenience:

- (1) What foreign nations have generalized tariff reductions or other trade favors to the United States under the unconditional most-favored-nation policy, as a result of granting such concessions to others since 1934.
- (2) What are the benefits, if any, that have been thus generalized.
- (3) How many bilateral-trade agreements exist between other nations, and whom between.
- (4) Which of these bilateral-trade agreements, if any, have been negotiated since 1934.
- (5) Whether any of the concessions in these bilateral agreements, if any, have been generalized to the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the resolution which I submitted yesterday has already achieved its purpose. I finally have a report from the United States Tariff Commission, and the need for the resolution is no longer apparent. Therefore I ask that it be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan advise us of the date of the letter?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not look at the date. The letter was received this morning.

Mr. BYRNES. I was just wondering whether the Senator knew the date of the letter, in order that he might put it in the RECORD with his statement. I do not know its date, but I should like to know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will say to the Senator that the letter apologizes for the failure to respond heretofore to my letter of January 17, and explains that the delay was due to the illness of one of the members of the Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

LETTER FROM HOOSIER TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION REGARDING NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, at this time, when all manner of charges are being made against the National Labor Relations Board, charging it especially with discrimination against so-called independent unions—those outside of the larger organizations—it is gratifying to receive from one of these organizations in my State a letter to the effect that no partiality has been shown so far as this organization is concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOSIER TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 5, 1940.

HON. SHERMAN MINTON,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With practically all newspapers in the country carrying articles concerning the Smith investigation of the Labor Board it is certainly an opportune time to reflect the views of quite a few thousand people who reside and work in a goodly number of States and who are members of an independent union.

At the very outset we wish to impress you with the fact that we are not affiliated with either of the major labor organizations, and therefore there is no partisan or biased motive attached to our expressions. However, we are interested in the labor movement and do not condone anything or any action which affects or may affect the movement's growth.

Labor for many years has been in a very unfavorable position, and there does not seem to be much sense in returning such a large percentage of our citizens to their previous insecure and undesirable position.

For the Government, or any individual representative or group of representatives, at Washington to listen to real, reasonable criticism of a law is one thing, but for the same individual or group to temper their judgment with only one side of a picture is an entirely different matter and deserving of serious thought by those who seek real justice. The social legislation of the past few years is something which should not be undone by short-sighted people who may have an ax to grind or who unknowingly believe that "two wrongs will make a right."

The Smith investigation and some other recent newspaper reports appear to be very partisan and biased, and therefore any right-thinking legislator or other person should not be misled by the inference attached to such reports.

Because our labor organization is independent, we are normally classified, as are nearly all independents, as being on the outside fringe of the labor movement. However, our contacts with the National Labor Relations Board have always been friendly, and we are convinced that, by and large, the administrators of the act are sincere in their endeavor to cause better labor relations between employees and employers. Any attack, of repulsive nature, is clearly indicative of management support and should be terminated before irreparable damage is done to the entire enterprise system.

If my memory serves me correctly, the activities of the Labor Board have been distinctly helpful to business in general and, with but few exceptions, its decisions have been fair and equitable. The fact that some mistakes have been made by a few of the personnel is no reason to condone the entire structure, otherwise we, of labor, cannot look for any impartial protective aid in the future. To err is human has been emphasized by such learned scholars as the Supreme Court Justices when they reversed their own decisions on occasions. The same weakness is present in the administration of any act of Congress. Therefore the attack on the Wagner Act and its administration should not be too greatly emphasized until it has had a much longer period of trial.

Amendments to the act and insinuations about various people connected with its administration are becoming a daily habit and I might say that it appears as though some of our industrialists, legislators, and even labor leaders are making a hobby of tearing down a good work. This should be stopped until all parties concerned have had the opportunity to adjust themselves to the relatively new order.

From all that has been written on the subject one would naturally think two things; firstly, that employers are not getting proper consideration, and secondly, the Board is partial to the C. I. O.

Having had the opportunity to be interested in a number of cases before regional boards and having read with interest the various reports of the Board, we can unequivocally state that employers are getting more than the benefit of a doubt and, being independent, our opinion should have some weight when we say that our experience has taught us the Board does not favor one group as against another.

The wisest thing and the just thing would be to let the act alone and to make changes in the Board personnel in the same sensible manner that any other executive changes are made either in business or in other governmental appointments.

Sincerely yours,

LEO GEORGE,
President, Hoosier Telephone Association, Inc.

PROPOSED LOAN TO FINLAND

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a debate over the Forum of the Air on Sunday, January 28, 1940, participated in by Senator KING, Senator GILLETTE, Senator WILEY, and Senator BROWN, on the Finnish loan question, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH ON OUR RELATION TO WORLD PEACE

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of our relation to world peace, delivered by him at the Women's National Democratic Club on Tuesday, February 6, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT AT MIAMI, FLA.

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Small Business the Key to Recovery, delivered by Senator Taft at Miami, Fla., on February 3, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on February 3, 1940, on the subject of the national defense, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DONALD R. RICHBERG BEFORE NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Donald R. Richberg on January 23, 1940, before the National Automobile Dealers' Association, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY CARL H. WILKEN BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Carl H. Wilken, secretary of the Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, together with a schedule accompanying the statement, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY EDWIN M. BORCHARD ON NEUTRALITY

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at South Orange, N. J., by Edwin M. Borchard, Hotchkiss professor of law, Yale University, on the question of United States neutrality, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY E. G. B. RILEY ON HOME-DEFENSE FORCE PLAN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by E. G. B. Riley on the subject of a home-defense force plan, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY COL. OSWALD W. MCNEESE BEFORE WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Col. Oswald W. McNeese before the fifteenth annual Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense held at Washington, D. C., February 1, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

SANE VIEW OF DEFENSE—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sane View of Defense," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Monday, February 5, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED LOAN TO FINLAND

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I rise to discuss briefly but very earnestly a subject which is much in the mind of everyone, yet one on which we seem to be having more difficulty than usual in making up our minds. I refer to the subject before the Congress and the people of this country—whether or not we shall help Finland financially; and if so, how we should extend the aid.

We have just learned that the Foreign Relations Committee acted today to approve an increase in the revolving fund of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as a prelude to a Finnish loan, which I assume this institution would make if Congress acted favorably on this plan. This is splendid so far as it goes, but I still fear we may from now on move too slowly. The Senate should act and at once.

LXXXVI—72

I feel very strongly that time is of the essence; that Congress should act immediately; and it is with this in mind more than to advocate or oppose any particular proposal that I bring up the subject, for, with all due respect to the committee, I cannot resist the observation that I hope most earnestly they will bring this question before the Senate as soon as possible.

My own personal view is that even if no other consideration were involved, Finland has earned the right again to receive financial aid from this Nation. Finland alone honored her financial obligations to this country, and, by the same token, has merited the right to again seek financial aid in her hour of desperate need and martyrdom. If we fail to recognize this, Finland can feel with justice that her integrity and honesty not only have gone unrewarded, but actually she would have been better off financially to have kept for herself, as did all the other nations, the money she paid back to the United States each day on the day it was due.

Moreover, it seems obvious to me that if we do not accord Finland the financial aid to which I think she is entitled, for the reasons I have given, others may well feel that they did the smart thing in their own selfish interest in not living up to their obligations to this country, in that they are no worse off than the one country which paid its debts to us. To put it differently, if Finland's integrity and honesty are to profit her nothing in her hour of dire need, what incentive would there be for anyone ever to pay anything that is owed to us?

Mr. President, entirely aside from this credit standing, which I feel Finland has so justly earned, we must, of course, consider whether or not it is compatible with the best interests of the United States to make a further loan to that country. With respect to this equally important consideration, I feel that it is indeed certain that our best interests do not lie in the success of the ruthless aggressor who is wantonly attempting to destroy Finland.

More important than anything else, no one can justify the assertion that to help Finland financially at this time is a step toward war. This is simply not so. No one is more alert against any move in that direction than myself. How could it be unless we wish to take that step which, of course, most certainly we do not and will not take?

Moreover, further financial aid to Finland at this time sets no precedent for extending the same aid in any other quarter, for in Finland's case alone imminent and desperate need is coupled with absolute assurance, based on actual experience, that if it is humanly possible they will repay every cent. I feel, too, that in according Finland the financial aid she so urgently needs at this time, in whatever amounts and whatever manner the Congress may decide on, it should be given not only at once but without any hampering restrictions as to how and where the money should be spent.

It is not my purpose to either make a long plea or an impassioned one based on sentimentality, but I am simply stressing my own conviction that we should do something for Finland, and, by the same token, I urge that this be done with all possible dispatch, and that we act as promptly as possible now, following the action of the committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I concur most heartily in the remarks just made by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I think it is high time that Congress act on this important subject, and I am delighted to express my concurrence in the sentiments uttered by him.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7922) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment on page 9, line 9, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$12,000,000" and to insert "\$11,000,000", so as to read:

Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities: For all necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator and the operation and maintenance of air-navigation facilities, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, repair, and overhaul of aircraft; purchase and exchange (not to exceed \$13,550), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; purchase of special wearing apparel and equipment for aviation purposes (including snowshoes and skis); salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed by the Administrator to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation; not to exceed 3 cents per mile for travel, in their personally owned automobiles within the limits of their official posts of duty, of employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of remotely controlled air-navigation facilities; and for the purchase of necessary food supplies (not exceeding \$2,500) for storage at isolated stations for emergency use, the cost of which when consumed by employees shall be collected therefrom, and deposited in miscellaneous receipts; \$11,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, addressing myself to the item under consideration in the bill now pending, which is an amendment of the Committee on Appropriations reducing the appropriation from \$12,000,000 to \$11,000,000 under the heading "Maintenance and operation," I will not detain the Senate long lest my remarks today might be a repetition of what I had occasion to say yesterday. I have again conferred with the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and I assert that if this reduction in the appropriation should be made and becomes effective, there is no question the program heretofore authorized, and for which appropriations were made, namely, for the installation of safety devices on the airways of this country as rapidly as possible, would be greatly impeded. There can be no question that safety devices of all kinds, provided by the mandate of the Congress of the United States, and for the installation of which appropriations were made, would remain unmanned and uncared for, and would either have to be stored where the elements will not destroy them, or some other means would have to be taken to protect them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am informed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority that so far as concerns 3,300 miles of airway protection now under construction, and to be completed before the end of the fiscal year 1941, most of it within the calendar year 1940, if this reduction should be made, there not only would not be sufficient money to operate those facilities, but there would be no money to pay for watchmen to protect them.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator because I was about to make that point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is all right. There would be no money with which to operate or do anything with them, except to leave them where they are, out in the elements, unprotected.

Mr. President, that is not the worst of this matter however. Congress, as result of a most careful investigation at the hands of Members of this body, and at the hands of the committee headed by our beloved colleague, the late Senator Copeland, set up a program, declared we would carry out that program, and have carried it out. Last year the greatest amount ever appropriated was made available in an effort to see to it that the program for providing safety facilities in the air, as set up by this body and by the other House, should be carried out.

That being true, Mr. President, however much we would economize, this is no time for Congress to turn back, when by turning back we would not only impair the program we adopted, but likewise would lose the money already appropriated. When I say we would lose the money, I mean that it would be a loss if we permitted this equipment to be unmanned and unprotected.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator has given thought to the details of this matter, I am sure, and will be glad to enlighten me. The inference I draw from the hearings before the Senate committee is that there would be 45 new stations, or whatever they are called—

Mr. McCARRAN. Air lines.

Mr. ADAMS. Forty-five new air lines put into operation under the program, under the appropriation for construction, and that it is planned to take on 519 employees. That was the maximum.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thought the number was 635, but the Senator may refer to a different figure.

Mr. ADAMS. I have gotten the figures in the last few minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I notice in one place Mr. Hester said there would be 635 new personnel.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I have before me an amplification of some of the testimony, furnished me by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which I intend to put into the RECORD.

Mr. ADAMS. I gather from the statement that there are 4 men to a station, in some larger stations perhaps more; so if we take the figure of 45 new stations, and figure 4 men in each, which would be sufficient personnel to protect them, there would be 180 men. If we should pay those men \$1,500 a year, which I think perhaps is a fair average, it would take \$270,000. If we should pay them \$2,000 on an average, it would take \$360,000. If we should take the whole 519 new men, all of whom would not serve the full year, because the program will not be instantly completed at the beginning of the fiscal year, and if we should pay those men \$1,500 a year, we would have to pay \$728,000. There is an increased appropriation of \$1,500,000. I am unable to see why one and a half million dollars will not take care of the increased personnel required to carry out the program. I make that as a statement rather than as an inquiry.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in reply to the able Senator from Colorado I wish to say that, as I gather from reading the hearings and from information which has come to me from members of the Authority, the question is not merely that of increase of one and a half million dollars, but the carrying out of a program heretofore authorized. If the program is carried out as it should be carried out, and these air lines are established with all proper safeguards and safety devices, and if the money already appropriated for the current year is used within the current year, as it is said it will be, for the installation of this equipment, and no additional money is provided, then, notwithstanding the figures which the Senator used, the equipment would remain unmanned and unused. If it is unmanned it is out of use.

I again return to the subject of economy. I will join in a program of economy, but, in my judgment, we can be parsimonious rather than economical. If I may make use of a very homely expression, and one which is not entirely apropos, we may be "penny-wise and pound-foolish."

Mr. President, when we have established a program which has effected such remarkable results as have been effected in the matter of air travel, with nearly 600,000,000 passenger-hours flown in America without a single fatality—and that achievement is due to the program set up under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938—I say when we have established a national program of that kind and have achieved such wonderful results, we should not hesitate to appropriate an additional sum of \$1,000,000 toward continuing the program. However much we would save the money of the Government, however much we would retrench, however much we might seek economy, we must realize that the proposed reduction is not true economy.

The fact of the matter is that it is no economy. As a matter of fact, by carrying out this program we shall not only establish a system which will place our country ahead of every other country in the world in the way of air navigation and air commerce, but likewise this \$1,000,000, if used

as it is intended it shall be used under the program, will strengthen our defenses, for every time we establish one of these air lines we will fortify our country.

Mr. President, every pilot who flies the air today is a potential warrior in time of war. The pilot who flies over this country today is better equipped to take hold of the controls, should his country call upon him in time of war, than any other man who could be selected. He needs no training. He knows the terrain. He knows the air currents. He knows the weather conditions. While we are developing the country from a commercial standpoint, and while we are improving air traveling conditions, we are likewise developing the country from a military standpoint. The dollars expended along this line will serve two purposes: One, to develop the country from within; and the other, to fortify and equip the country for its defense in time of war.

Mr. President, I was sorry to have the Senate act adversely on the two items voted upon yesterday, but I appeal to the Senate today to restore the amount in the item under consideration, because I want to see this program go forward. I do not want to see human lives lost in the great development of air travel. I do not want to see any other Member of this body perhaps lose his life in the air. I do not want to see any other outstanding citizen numbered among the dead by reason of failure to provide safety devices. I do not want to see a catastrophe occur simply for lack of the amount in question.

I wish to see this program go forward along sane, sensible, sound lines. If ever a commission was appointed by a President which carried out the spirit and intention of the law, certainly the Civil Aeronautics Authority has carried out the part assigned to it, and has made a great and outstanding success.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Transportation by air between the East and the West is growing rapidly. I have been amazed at its growth in the last 5 years. I am curious to know if the million dollars which is proposed to be deducted from this item in any way involves the safety of transportation by air. If we reduce the amount from \$12,000,000 to \$11,000,000, will it in any way imperil the lives of those who travel, or will it add to the hazard of travel by air? I wish the Senator would address himself to that feature and specifically point out—I know he is able to do so—the relation between safety and the \$1,000,000 which it is proposed to deduct from the amount to be given the Authority.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will try to make myself clear. Congress directed that a certain system of airways should be established. The law provides that whenever the Post Office Department calls for the transportation of mail over certain lines, then the Civil Aeronautics Authority must immediately take steps to see to it that mail is carried over those lines. Congress provided that this system should include the establishment of safety devices such as lighting, radio beams, and the protective devices for landing fields, and so on, including what is known as the teletype. All of that, Mr. President, is largely mechanical. These are mechanical devices set up along the lines of flight. Sometimes they serve a dual purpose. In other words, one beacon may be a guide to two air lines, which is very frequently the case. But when the mechanical devices, which are provided for, as I have stated, by appropriations already made, are set up, then they must be manned. Personnel is necessary to man them. For instance, a beacon light having a certain candlepower or a certain intensity must be manned perhaps by 1 man or 2 men, and in some instances the operation of certain mechanical devices requires, I am told, as many as 15 men. But we must have the necessary personnel, which personnel would be cut off by the elimination of the \$1,000,000 in question. We must have personnel to man equipment already installed. That is what I want to make plain as best I can; we must have the personnel required to make effective the mechanical devices for which Congress appropriated a year ago, and which have been

up to date installed or will be installed before the end of the fiscal year. If those devices stand out in the open, in the elements, as they are now throughout the country, and remain undermanned, then they are simply a loss to everyone.

Mr. President, I do not care to take the time of the Senate any longer. To me the matter is very important. I think more has been accomplished for aviation by the Civil Aeronautics Act, 1938, than was accomplished in half a century before. I want to see aviation go forward. I want to see it go forward in an orderly manner. It cannot go forward in an orderly manner unless we carry out the orderly procedure of seeing to it that safety to human life and to property is guaranteed by every means that human hands can afford.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it has been my purpose all along, and is now, and will continue to be, to support our regularly constituted committees in every instance that I possibly can. In this case I shall not be able to go along with the Appropriations Committee, recommending the reduction of this item for maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities from \$12,000,000 to \$11,000,000. Such a reduction would gravely affect the progress of aeronautics in my State. Two very important air lines have been established there in the past 2 years, one from Tallahassee down the west coast to Tampa and Miami, and another from Jacksonville to New Orleans. The Government has gone to the expense of establishing beacon or beam lights along the way for the safety of navigation. They will be of no use if they are not maintained.

The committee amendment, if adopted, would eliminate the maintenance of those beacon lights on those airways.

I am interested in this item for another reason. I happen to be on a committee with the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and we considered our aeronautics measures very carefully after consuming much time in taking testimony. The system is now progressing fairly well, and I would not like to see this most important activity curtailed.

I also happen to be a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, which has provided a program involving the appropriation of over \$1,000,000,000 to provide for us one of the greatest defense programs, not only to include battleships on the seas and submarines under the seas, but providing for our defense one of the finest naval air units that can be devised by the ingenuity of man.

In my judgment, that money, if properly spent—and I am sure it will be, because it is in the hands of our experts—will perhaps in the ultimate save this country from a conflict which we do not want to enter. If in 1917 we had had the Navy which we are now providing on the sea, in the air, and under the sea, and which we propose to perfect within the next 2 years, we, more than likely, would never have entered the great World War. We were forced into it because the German Government knew we were not prepared; and it was more than a year before we ever flew an airplane or used a gun manufactured in the United States. If we had not been drawn into that conflict the indications are that this country would have saved, up to this time, more than \$30,000,000,000.

I am one of those who believe that an ounce of prevention is worth not only a pound of cure but, in matters of preparedness, more than that. Recently there landed in my home city of Orlando more than 600 pilots with their planes. This activity was a part of the annual tournament sponsored and encouraged by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

We cannot turn back now. We are manufacturing many airplanes to be used in both the Army and the Navy. We want the finest brains of the country to be trained to operate them. In promoting aeronautics we are not only preparing to place America in the forefront of commercial aviation, with its many great advantages to us nationally and internationally, but we are also preparing the people of the country for any eventuality in case democracy breaks down in Europe. Our aircraft will constitute our first line of defense.

Mr. President, I could give other reasons why I would prefer not to see the committee amendment prevail, but I shall not take the time of the Senate now to present them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to call attention briefly to a thought suggested by the remarks of

the Senator from Florida; namely, the connection of this matter with the problem of national defense.

This debate has proceeded almost exclusively upon the question of the aid rendered by aviation safety facilities to the air lines of the United States and the building up of the traffic of the air lines of the United States, both passenger and mail flights. I wish very briefly to call attention to the fact that these facilities are not only used by the air lines of the United States for the protection of the passengers on the air lines and the freight shipped on the air lines, but they are now used every day of the year to a very large and considerable extent by the Army and National Guard planes and the Navy and Marine Corps planes of the United States provided for the purpose of national defense, and also to a very large extent by private commercial planes not connected with air lines, and by private planes being flown for various reasons.

Of course, a great many of the airplanes use the Federal airways without any record being made of them, since only contacts between aircraft and the Civil Aeronautics Authority airway traffic control create any accurate record. However, such as the records are, during the fiscal year 1939 the total number of aircraft movements—that is, take-offs and landings—controlled by airway traffic control amounted to 403,980. Of this total 241,884, or 59.9 percent, were airway-carrier operations, while 162,000, or 40.1 percent, were nonair carriers of all types.

A further segregation was made for a sample week, the week of January 6, 1940. During that week a total of 17,470 aircraft movements were controlled, or at the rate, based upon the sample week, of more than 900,000 a year. Of that total, 10,339 were air-carrier movements. This is 59.2 percent of the total. The fact that this percentage agrees so closely with the air-carrier percentage for the previous fiscal year suggests that the sample week taken is a fair one.

The total distribution of the traffic-controlled movements for that week was: Air carriers, 10,339, or 59.2 percent; Army and National Guard planes, 5,769, or 33 percent; Navy and Marine Corps planes, 672, or 3.8 percent; private and non-scheduled commercial planes, 690, or 4 percent.

So, Mr. President, it is apparent that these facilities are necessary and valuable not only for the safety of the public traveling on our air lines, but also for the protection and safety of Government vessels, many of which are engaged in the national defense or in preparation for the national defense.

Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], being in possession of the floor, proceeded without giving me a chance to reply, refusing to yield to me to make reference to some statements which I had made upon the floor of the Senate within the year in criticism of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Unlike the Senator from Kansas, I yield.

Mr. REED. In 30 seconds after the Senator from Missouri asked me to yield I yielded to the Senator from Missouri, and he stated in the Record that he desired to take the floor in his own right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that after making a considerable speech and yielding to several other Senators he finally did say he would yield to me; but he flatly refused to yield to me at the time he made reference to me—something I have never yet done upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. REED. If I may make a suggestion, I asked the Senator to wait just a moment and I would yield to him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, be that as it may, it is not important. The fact is that when the reorganization bill was under consideration in the Senate I supported the proposition of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], in charge of the bill, that the Civil Aeronautics Authority ought not to be exempted from the general authority of the President to combine bureaus or consolidate their functions. I pointed out the very large growth of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in the short time it had been constituted, and criticized, not only on the floor but in other places, the fact

that the Civil Aeronautics Authority had taken over bodily one of the most inefficient bureaus of the Government, the old Bureau of Air Commerce in the Commerce Department, and had not cleaned up that Bureau by discharging many who had been working for it. That criticism was good at that time, Mr. President. I adhere to it. Part of it is still good, although the Civil Aeronautics Authority has made a great improvement in the matter of cleaning up its personnel.

Be that as it may, Mr. President; that has nothing whatever to do with the question involved in the pending amendment. The amendment has to do with the question of the safety of those who fly in American planes in the United States. It has to do with the efficiency of a system which Congress directed the Civil Aeronautics Authority to install, which it has installed, and which it has been operating with notable success. It has to do with the question of whether or not the system planned and ordered by Congress as the result of the investigations of the Copeland committee, which was originally constituted following the tragic death of a distinguished Member of this body, shall be carried out and put into full and complete operation.

I stated a moment ago, on the authority of the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, that if the reduction of \$1,000,000 takes place, 3,300 miles of facilities already in process of installation under authority and direction of Congress will have no appropriation for their operation.

Much has been said about the increase in personnel. I do not wish to be tedious with the Senate; but, since so much has been said about that matter, I wish to point out what the increase in personnel amounts to in relation to airway safety installation, having to do not with bureaucrats in Washington, but with safety of travel in the air. I wish to point out why that increase in personnel is necessary and desirable as the result of the increase in the facilities which have been installed and are being installed by direction of the Congress.

The increase in the number of personnel provided for in the appropriation for maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities for 1941 over that provided for in the allotment out of salaries and expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Authority for 1940 for that purpose, as well as the increase in other items of expense, is due to the increase in extent of the Federal airways safety system, involving primarily an increase in number and type of aids to air navigation which require personnel for their operation, maintenance, and supervision, and secondarily a resultant increase in the volume of work at certain of the hitherto existing stations necessitating increased personnel complements at some of the important points.

Mr. President, I take it to be a proposition so simple that no one will controvert it, that safety installation over a railroad system or an ocean transportation system involving thousands of miles, say, 10,000 miles, requires a greater personnel for its operation and its protection and its repair and its care than a system of 500 miles or a thousand miles. It does not matter what form of transportation it may be, the greater the safety installation the greater its extent, the greater its complexity the greater its meticulousness, the greater the number of personnel required.

The construction appropriation for the establishment of air-navigation facilities in 1940—the current fiscal year—in the amount of \$7,000,000 was the largest ever granted for this purpose. Consequently the resultant increase in the extent of the Federal airway system is more marked than ever before.

The principal features of the physical increase due to construction work being accomplished in 1940 and the accompanying increases in personnel for operation and maintenance are as follows—and this is the explanation of the increase in personnel asked for in connection with this safety system:

Lighted airways mileage, an increase of 4,590 miles in the fiscal year, requiring an additional personnel, according to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, of 93 persons. Included in the lighted airways mileage are 41 landing fields and 288 beacon lights.

Standard radio range and communication stations, 47 units, requiring a personnel, according to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, of 258.

Other types of radio stations, 162, requiring an additional personnel of 140. A break-down of the figures for the 162 units show 95 ultra-high-frequency fan markers, 9 ultra-high-frequency radio ranges, 55 ultra-high-frequency zone markers, and 3 transoceanic communication stations.

There are 10 new instrument landing stations, requiring an additional personnel of 5.

Teletype communications system mileage, 4,470, broken down into 32 teletype stations at radio ranges, and 14 independent teletype stations, requiring, according to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, an additional personnel of 63.

Three new traffic-control centers, requiring an additional personnel of 33.

The new Washington National Airport—and the present one has been a disgrace and menace to the United States for years—will require an additional personnel of 38 operators.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the Senator inform us as to the cost of the new Washington Airport?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am unable to supply the Senator with the figure, although I will be glad to get it for him and furnish it to him later.

Installation of air-navigation facilities along new routes inevitably creates greater volume of work, particularly in communications and airways traffic control, at the stations on the old routes which become the junction points with the new routes, and this together with the tremendous increase in air traffic of all types—commercial, military, and private—bring about the need for added communications and traffic control operations personnel at hitherto existing stations to the extent of 155.

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that prior to the fiscal year 1940 there were no Federal air-navigation aids whatever in Alaska, but this year installation of such aids is in process. It is necessary also to establish a regional headquarters office and repair depot to administer and supervise the maintenance and operation of these aids, which will require an additional personnel of 31.

In addition to the increased personnel assigned directly to the various type of aids, and the new Alaska headquarters office and repair depot, increased administrative and supervisory personnel are required in the Washington office and in the seven regional headquarters offices and repair depots on account of the increased work involved in administration, supervision, and inspection of the greatly increased airways system. These are distributed as follows:

Office of Administrator, one.

Airways Engineering Division, Washington, 50, 40 of whom for the past year or two have been employed and paid from another appropriation, namely, a W. P. A. allotment, so that the real increase in personnel in this case is only 10.

The Airways Operation Division in Washington requires an increased personnel, despite the vast extension of the system, of only five.

The seven regional headquarters offices and repair depots require an increase in personnel of 61.

The central radio repair and supply depot at Fort Worth requires an additional personnel of 32, of which a number have already been employed under other appropriations.

The total additional personnel required for the increased facilities since the close of the fiscal year 1939 is 965. Obviously the 1940 construction activities are of the continuing type, and many of the stations are completed and ready for operation during the course of the fiscal year. As these stations are completed people are immediately employed and assigned to their operation with funds available in the allocation out of Salaries and Expenses, Civil Aeronautics Authority, 1940, for maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities. Thus provision has been made for employing during such parts of fiscal year 1940, as they may be required, 438—including the 72 in Airways Engineering Division and central depot, which are transfers, not actual increases—of the total of 965, leaving to be employed on or after the beginning of fiscal year 1941, 527, which is the net increase for the operation of the air-safety program.

Mr. President, I assume that no one will assert that it would be to the interest of any railroad corporation to install a fine signal safety system over its entire route and then not provide adequate and intelligent personnel for its operation. Certainly it would not be to the interest of the Government of the United States to establish lighthouses and other safeguards for navigation and then not supply a sufficient personnel and a sufficient appropriation for their proper operation, inspection, maintenance, and repair. Certainly it would not be to the interest of a great railroad system to build a fine terminal and then to be niggardly with the last half mile of the approaches leading into the terminal, or to install a system for an automatic control of trains coming into the terminal and then not provide sufficient funds for its operation and maintenance.

As I said on yesterday, Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the ghastly condition of the air safety aids in this country was ultimately revealed by reason of the fact that a Member of this body was killed. Heaven knows how long that condition might have continued but for the death of Senator Cutting. It seems to me that the death of any other citizen flying over the air lines of this country is fully as important as is the death of a United States Senator, and I hope that it may not be necessary to have further accidents in this country in order to assure the completion of the air-safety program.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to say that I am in complete agreement with the distinguished Senators from Missouri, Nevada, and Wyoming as to safety.

Being curious about the Civil Aeronautics Authority, I obtained their first annual report. So far as I have talked with Members of this body, I have not yet found anybody who has read it. I have. Here is a map in the report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Every main line in this country is lighted now, has been, and will continue to be.

So much for that.

I desire to congratulate the Senators who had a part in improving the air service by the creation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I have no criticism to offer of them. When this matter came up yesterday, I had not read their full report. I read it last night; and if any Senator can take the report and find in it any excuse for the expenditure of money for the purpose stated by the Senators who are opposed to the action of the committee, they have the advantage of me. I cannot find in the report a single word which justifies it.

There are some things in the report that should interest the Senate. It is true, as stated by the Senators from Missouri and Nevada, that we have made heavy appropriations for aeronautical purposes. Does the Senate know that last year, in addition to such appropriations made by Congress, \$40,000,000 of relief funds were expended on airports and their improvement?

I read from page 14 of the First Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority for 1939:

Absence, during the year under discussion, of any formal national airport policy did not mean, of course, lack of Federal participation in airport projects. During the period covered by this report approximately \$40,000,000 of Federal relief funds were expended upon the enlargement and improvement of some 307 airports throughout the country. Local sponsorship and participation increased total expenditures on these projects to approximately \$62,300,000.

Mr. President, it is easy to let one's enthusiasm for a certain cause run away with his best judgment; and that is the only point to which I am addressing myself. All that I say is predicated upon the first annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority itself.

There ought to be some relationship between money expended and the results obtained. I said yesterday, and reiterated in response to the question of the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], that in the initial phases we had subsidized every different kind of transportation in this country. We subsidized water in the first place; we subsidized railroads in the second place; we subsidized highways in the third place; and we are now subsidizing aeronautics, to what extent? Let me tell the Senate to what extent we are subsidizing aeronautics.

Again I refer to the report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. On page 51 they report the revenues from air traffic. There is a large amount of detailed information in the report that would not be of any interest, and it would be impossible to put it into the Record. I call attention, however, to these high lights:

In addition to the appropriation made by the Congress, there was expended on airports last year \$62,000,000. The Government paid the air companies for carrying the mails—I read now from page 51 of the report—\$16,669,197.21. I am not saying whether that is too much or too little or just sufficient. It cost approximately \$2 per ton-mile. That is what we pay the air companies for carrying the mails; and they collected \$16,000,000. All their other business combined, according to this report, amounted to \$30,650,694.83.

The appropriation carried by this bill alone runs over \$26,000,000, almost equal to the gross revenue of the air carriers, in addition, without the mail pay from the Government for which the Government received service. If we add the Government payment of \$16,000,000, the Government, through appropriations and by mail pay last year, paid \$42,000,000, while all the other business of the air companies—I am referring to gross revenue, not net revenue—was \$30,000,000.

So far as I know, we have never subsidized any other business in this country—transportation or anything else—almost to the full extent of its gross revenues from every other source. For airplanes we provide airports, we provide runways, we provide radio beams, we maintain radio stations, we operate some thousands of miles of teletype service. We do everything for them. I do not mean to say that they do not pay anything in the way of fees for the use of airports. As a matter of fact, in this report it is said, and, in addition, the Civil Aeronautics Authority this morning gave me some information to the same effect, that on the average they pay about \$50 per month for scheduled flights for the use of airports for landing.

What is the result? I desire to illustrate from my own experience. Within the past week I flew from here to Kansas City and flew back again, for the purpose of saving time. I paid for the round trip about \$101. It is about 2,400 miles, according to the aircraft schedule. I paid about 4 cents a mile, but I saved a great deal of time. I did not pay all my fare. The Government of the United States, through subsidies to the air carriers, paid half of my fare, and I paid only the other half.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Of course, the Senator realizes that when he drives his automobile from here to Kansas City and back he pays his gasoline bill, but he does not pay for the highway he uses; and the Government probably pays a larger proportion of his actual expenses than it pays in the case of the air lines. Of course, the subsidy days of the railroads are gone. In the old days in the West I dare say that the railroads received substantial subsidies which would compare with the subsidy that is being paid for air-line transportation today; but it is a peculiar thing that once an industry gets a subsidy it gets a monopoly, and it does not want anybody else to have it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my friend from Idaho knows the declaration I made on this floor in the debate over the General Transportation Act, representing my own views, because they are not included in the act—that whenever highways created by funds from the Public Treasury, whether air or land or railroad or rivers, are used for commercial purposes to make a profit, the user should pay a toll which will reasonably reimburse the taxpayer for his money. I say that about airways. The Government of the United States has no business and no right in equity to take the taxpayer's money and pay half the expense of my own trip to Kansas City.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we can all agree to the general proposition announced by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will vote that way.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Whether we like it or not, Congress has created a Civil Aeronautics Authority. The question in my mind is, Does the Senator from Kansas want to let that Authority carry on in order to effectuate the purposes Congress had in mind, or shall we curtail it to such an extent that it will be ineffective?

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that if the recommendation of the committee is accepted and adopted, the Civil Aeronautics Authority will have a million and a half more dollars for the next fiscal year than they have for the present fiscal year under the item recommended by the committee; and, in my opinion, that is amply adequate.

The Senator from New Mexico is one of the ablest Senators on this floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. He knows that a Government bureau or department always regards itself as the most important; and in a burst of enthusiasm—and this time to my very regret—their enthusiasm is supported by some overenthusiastic Members of the Senate, whose fears, in my opinion, are wholly unfounded. I think we can accept every recommendation of the committee without in any way restricting or curtailing any useful purpose which the Civil Aeronautics Authority has to carry on. What I am trying to do, and all I am trying to do, is to take care of the taxpayers' money, as much as a minority Senator can do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to assure the Senator from Kansas that it is the desire of the Senator from New Mexico to cut down expenses every time we can do it intelligently. I wish to assure the Senator from Kansas that I am one of those overenthusiastic air-minded people.

Mr. REED. I feared the Senator from New Mexico might be one of them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I still maintain that during these days, when we are talking about national defense, it will not be very long before every Member of this body will be overenthusiastic about national defense as afforded by airplanes.

Mr. REED. If I may say so to the Senator from New Mexico, we appropriated during the last session about \$800,000,000 for the War Department Air Service, and I have forgotten the figures for the Navy Department. They train their own pilots. The report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority states that at the beginning of the fiscal year—and I am giving these figures from memory—there were about 21,000 or 22,000 qualified pilots in the commercial service. Those figures do not include the military or naval service. That number increased last year about 8,000, so that there are now approximately 30,000 qualified pilots.

There is no relation between commercial flying and national defense except possibly in one respect. I think it is a healthy thing that the Army and the Navy may have the benefit of any improvements made by manufacturers of commercial planes, and also the use of a trained force of pilots which has now reached the number of 30,000 men.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it is a very fine thing for the national defense of the country that the commercial airplane companies can train pilots who may be available in time of emergency. It is also a good thing that we have made such progress in commercial flying in this country that it is heralded throughout the world.

I maintain that our national defense in the future will not be the Navy, or battleships, or anything else, but the

airplanes of the future and what we have now. Hence I am for anything that may be done for the making of better pilots and for bringing about of technical improvements in this field.

I agree with the Senator that we should cut down expenses, but to my mind making a cut in an appropriation which is absolutely essential is not the right kind of economy. I am in favor of cutting to the limit Government expenses in items which may be wasteful, but the airplane business is new, and we cannot judge of airplane matters or the business of developing airplanes by the railroads or the highways any more than we can go back to the times of the tallow candle. We have to face the world as it is today. I believe that we cannot do too much in this country for this service, and that we will not be wasting anything if we shall provide the necessary funds for an authority of the Government created by us.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am not quarreling with the Senator from New Mexico in his last statement. Let me ask him a question: Did he ever hear of any business in this country, the transportation business or any other business, that was subsidized by the Government to the full extent of its gross revenue?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I respect the Senator from Kansas too much to answer that question.

Mr. REED. I publish a newspaper. I wish the Government would subsidize me in the gathering of news, and the transmission of news, and all that sort of thing, so that all I had to do would be to print and distribute my newspaper.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How much does the Senator from Kansas pay for mailing the newspapers to his subscribers?

Mr. REED. I should be very happy to tell the Senator if it had any part in this debate. I pay enough.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to draw his attention to one matter. My observation grows out of a remark he made not long ago, and I should like to invite his attention to the time in 1934 when we canceled the contracts for carrying the mails by air.

Mr. REED. Let me interrupt the Senator to say that it was his administration, not mine, that did that.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not talking about administrations; I am talking about facts.

Mr. REED. There is a good deal of error about the Senator's administration.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is all right; we are trying to perform our duty. If I could get the Senator from Kansas to join with me for this \$12,000,000 appropriation, I would feel that I had performed my duty.

At the time to which I refer, the Government undertook to fly the mail with Army fliers. Eleven of the finest boys in the Army lost their lives at that time. I now draw the Senator's attention to the fact that those lives were snuffed out, in an attempt to fly the mail, because proper safety devices were not then in existence. Otherwise those boys would not have been sacrificed. They were turned loose to carry the mail over terrain about which they knew nothing whatever, through air currents of which they had never been advised, and the result was crash after crash, until 11 of them were killed within some 6 weeks.

If safety devices such as we have been installing under the appropriations made by Congress had been installed at that time the lives of 11 fine boys would have been saved.

I draw this matter to the attention of the Senator before he takes his seat because it illustrates the very thing we are trying to do here, namely, to carry out a program which has enlisted this comment from a President of the United States:

The air lines have performed a marvelous service, flying 500,000,000 passenger-miles without a single fatality.

I want the Senator to dwell on that, because he mentioned the \$300,000,000 we appropriated for military aviation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my answer to the Senator from Nevada is that the things about which he speaks as

having happened in 1934 have no relevancy whatever to the present situation.

I have no quarrel with all reasonable appropriations which ought to be made for safety in aeronautics. I do have a quarrel with overenthusiasm which takes the taxpayers' money to give me a personal benefit such as I have had in the last week or 10 days. I do not think we have any right to do that, and that is what this overenthusiasm, both in the Civil Aeronautics Authority and as it has been displayed on the floor of the Senate, will do and is doing, and it should not continue.

Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have taken this matter up because after reading the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and studying it, I am fully convinced that the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations will not in any way lessen the safety of travel by air or impair the necessary operation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. If I thought they would, I would take a different position. I have not yet found any Senator who has taken the trouble I have taken to get the first report of the organization in which the Senator from Nevada takes so much pride, and has analyzed it and studied it, and has come to the conclusion which I have stated.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator, if I may, to the fact that I have had this report ever since it was published, but my maps are a little more complete than the Senator's maps, because I have drawn many lines on them. If the Senator will look at the shaded lines on the first map and the dotted lines on the second map, he will find that they represent air lines and airways in connection with which \$7,000,000 was appropriated last year for the construction of various safety devices which are now established or will be established by next July 1.

I have read the report through, not only once, but I suppose perhaps four or five times intermittently, and I should be very much interested in knowing how the Senator can read the report and then conclude that men will not be necessary to take care of these devices, this electrical equipment, the lighting equipment; how they can be hired unless money is appropriated to hire them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I may have an advantage or perhaps be at a disadvantage as compared with the Senator from Idaho. I have been at the head of Government bureaus, and I have always found that I could operate them cheaper and with less expenditure than many persons thought was possible. I think that is also true of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I want to give the Senator from Idaho a direct answer. Eliminating the details which the Senator mentioned, I still say that it is my very best judgment that the Civil Aeronautics Authority can administer this work with perfect safety in the next fiscal year under the appropriation given by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a great deal of this debate has centered about a comparative discussion between the appropriation for the current year and the appropriation for the next fiscal year. Some Senators have suggested that the appropriations contained in the pending measure, because they represent an increase over the appropriation for the current year, will be adequate and sufficient for all purposes for which the Civil Aeronautics Authority has been created.

Mr. President, I register no complaint, nor do I find fault with the Appropriations Committee, nor with those who take issue with the Appropriations Committee. However, I desire to point out something which has not been emphasized to my satisfaction, insofar as this particular debate is concerned. My distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. REED], indicating a desire for economy that is insatiable in the breast of every Senator, makes the point that not \$1 of the taxpayers' money should be used for the purposes of this particular appropriation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. That is the end to which we work. I did not intend to be understood as saying that we could cut it off all at once. I think that would be impossible. But I do think that we ought to begin to economize.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the Senator for that observation. I knew that he would not go so far as to impoverish the Authority. But I was merely making the point that insofar as this particular item is concerned we have been led to believe that we are opening up the Treasury in order to subsidize our commercial air lines.

This particular item pertains to and applies to the air lines of the United States. The "airways" is another way of explaining what this item refers to. The airways are the common property of the people of America. They are in the sole care of the Government of the United States; they are used by the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard; they are used by our commercial lines; and they are also used by every private pilot in the United States. The air lines and the facilities necessary in order that those air lines might be up to date, the care of the air lines, the installation of the air lines, the common property of the people of America, are the root of this particular appropriation. That is the big point that I wish to contribute to this debate.

Another point I wish to make is that we are forgetting—in fact, I hardly believe we can comprehend—the phenomenal, if not the sensational, growth and development of the aviation industry in America. It is more stupendous than was the growth and development of the automobile industry in America. If one reflects and makes a comparative study of the building of the airways and the building of the highways, one will find that we are not appropriating much as compared with which the rise in the automobile industry made it necessary and essential for us to appropriate. We could not keep up with the necessary highway construction. We poured hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars into such projects. We are discussing the appropriation of only \$1,000,000 to keep the air lines open and safe for every air mail, commercial, and military purpose that is approved by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. President, I make this prediction: In the year 1940 the greatest expansion of the aviation industry will take place. We will not have nearly enough facilities to cope with the development of the industry.

So I ask Senators to consider, first of all, the reason for which this appropriation is meant. It is necessary to consider the marvelous, the phenomenal growth of the industry that is to take place, and that will require more facilities of this character than have been provided in the past.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. REED. I may ask the distinguished junior Senator from New York whether he agrees with my premise that when we use the taxpayers' money to create a highway upon which there is travel for commercial use, for profit, that that travel ought to pay a toll commensurate with the amount of money that we have taken from the taxpayers who create the highway? Does the Senator from New York agree with that?

Mr. MEAD. The day of the toll road and the toll bridge is over.

Mr. REED. But not the toll highway. The United States Government is paying half of the expense of the trip that I myself made to Kansas City within the last week.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in order that I might answer that question more fully than would be the answer if I said yes or no, let us look into the situation. Let us analyze the financial reports, the air-mail reports, that are available up to date. And let me say to the Senator from Kansas that every major air line in the United States, every large continental line, and every major line other than a transcontinental line, is earning money, is paying its own way, and in some instances is yielding a profit to the Post Office Department for carrying the mail. The reports sustain that contention.

Let me say further to the Senator—and I have what I assume to be fairly authentic authority—that the lines are

paying in other ways. Not only are they in some instances paying a profit to the Government for the expeditious carrying of the mail, but they are beginning to earn their own way. They are coming out of the red. And they are meeting a very substantial tax payment levied against them by the State and the Federal Governments.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from New York certainly does not mean that in earnest, because—

Mr. MEAD. The Senator means just that.

Mr. REED. The reports show that out of 37 air companies 35 of them were in the black in the last fiscal year, and 2 of them are still in the red, but in order to achieve that result they had to have all these services furnished to them which we are furnishing through the appropriations and through relief funds. I know the Senator from New York desires to be accurate. The statement I have made is true. The only way they can carry on is through Government subsidies.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MEAD. If I may first answer the Senator from Kansas, I shall be glad to yield later to the Senator from New Mexico.

Of course, the Senator realizes that if what he says is accurate, and we should remove all these facilities because they are a charge against the Treasury, then every one of the facilities, with few exceptions, will have to be replaced for the purposes of the Army and Navy and for the purposes of others who use the air and who are not listed as commercial air lines.

The point I wish to make is that the air lanes belong to the people of America. Neither the Senator nor I have any right to charge them as an expense to the Army, to the Navy, to the thousands of private fliers, or to the commercial air lines. They are utilized by all, and they are the common property of all, and they should ever remain within our power and authority.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to have the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] straighten out one particular matter. He seems to be of the opinion that the airway companies are receiving the service for nothing. It is true that the Government has spent some money building airports throughout the country—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me correct the Senator from New Mexico. I stated awhile ago that the air lines did pay some fees. It is so stated in the report. They are given in too much detail to undertake to put them into the RECORD, but any Senator may inform himself by reading the report of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in that connection.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; but I wish to inform the Senator from Kansas of one particular fact in reference to expenses of airway companies. Some time ago he mentioned the fact that the W. P. A. or some Government agency had spent some money building airports. That is correct. One such airport was built in my home city of Albuquerque. It is a wonderful plant, as fine an airport as there is in the entire United States; and while it is true that the W. P. A. spent some money, the city of Albuquerque spent some money, and I know that that money was paid in lease rentals by the airway companies. They were the ones who advanced the money, paying their lease money in advance in order to enable the city of Albuquerque to put up the amount necessary to carry out the work of the W. P. A.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

There are hundreds of cities in the United States which, at great sacrifice to themselves and to their own taxpayers, have constructed modern airports. Those airports in many instances are not used by the commercial air lines referred to by the Senator from Kansas. Of course, that service would

be welcomed, but the point I wish to make is that those airports have been constructed and are being used as schools of instruction for training units or for the manufacturing activities of the area or for the private flyers who reside in the community. Therefore it is impossible to say that the United States Government has at great expense subsidized the commercial air lines, because the commercial phase is but one phase of the entire aviation activity of America. The Old World countries have spent fabulous sums of money in setting up the system which we are discussing and in building airports, and it was all charged to the military. However, in America we emphasize commercial aviation, and as a result we have the finest system in all the world. It has not been built for the military defense of the country, but, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] well pointed out, it will be capable of coming to our defense in no uncertain terms; and the \$1,000,000 contained in this appropriation—a drop in the bucket compared to the building of one battleship—will, in my judgment, be a better contribution to national defense than the building of a battleship.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. REED. For the information of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I should like to read from a statement sent to me this morning by the Civil Aeronautics Authority:

Landing fees or rentals to scheduled air-line operators seem to vary from nothing to several hundred dollars per month. The mean average of all landing fees appears to be about fifty or sixty dollars per month. This figure cannot be taken as a definite criterion, due to the extreme variation in charges. The 1938 questionnaires available indicate that over \$350,000 has been paid to airports (all airports) in forms of landing fees.

In addition to landing fees, charges are made for office rentals in hangars and administration buildings. Again, these charges range from nothing to thousands of dollars per year, depending upon the amount of space occupied and the type of accommodation furnished.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for just a moment?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that statement is correct, I know one airway company which has been badly treated.

Mr. REED. I am giving the Senator from New Mexico the answer to the question he raised.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I believe I have dealt with the subject of air lanes, their use and their control, sufficiently to impress Senators with the fact that we cannot charge to the commercial air lines all the costs of construction of airports, air lanes, and facilities such as are included in this item in the appropriation bill. The air lanes of America will forever remain in the control of the United States Government; and who knows but that all the equipment will be taken over in the event of war? Therefore, they will always remain under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency.

Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that we were forgetting another point, and that is the phenomenal growth of aviation. We cannot visualize it. It is making a tremendous contribution to the Nation's economy. It is not only returning a profit to the Post Office Department, insofar as the older lines are concerned, but it is returning a profit if we consider it in its probable economic aspect.

I have before me press reports gathered from a few newspapers for one day. These reports bear on the point I am making in connection with the phenomenal growth of aviation.

The first is from the New York Herald Tribune. It says:

New safety record made by United States air lines in 1939—82,000,000 passenger-miles flown for each fatality—contrasts with 22,308,771 passenger-miles per passenger-fatality in 1938 and 21,080,515 in 1933, the best previous years; approximately 5,000,000 passengers were carried on scheduled and nonscheduled flights in 1939 and more than 6,000 private pilots were issued licenses during the year.

That splendid record should stimulate a desire on our part further to enhance the safety of travel by air by being very considerate and very careful about matters of this kind.

I have a clipping from the Wall Street Journal, which says:

AIR LINES HAD FIRST PROFITABLE YEAR IN HISTORY IN 1939

(By Gaston E. Marquie)

Acceleration of good trend indicated for coming year, more equipment ordered, likely to seek new capital, gives comparative table showing revenue passenger-miles of railroads and air lines.

This is somewhat of an answer to the statement made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

I have a clipping from the New York Times, which says:

ENOUGH AIRCRAFT ORDERS ON HAND TO KEEP SOME FIRMS BUSY INTO 1941

(By T. C. Sullivan)

Total backlog, about \$680,000,000 against \$175,000,000 at beginning of 1939; war is large factor in outlook; plant expansion programs completed or undertaken during 1939 will provide the industry with factory space 30 to 40 percent greater than a year ago.

That is a stupendous rise.

I have the following from the Washington (D. C.) Star:

DOUGLAS REPORTS RECORD ORDERS FOR AIR LINES IN LAST 6 MONTHS

Since June 1, 1939, orders for 82 air liners, valued at approximately \$10,000,000, have been placed by air-line operators with Douglas, the majority of which are for the popular 21-passenger DC-3 transport and sleeper planes; will begin construction at once on 40 giant DC-4 planes.

From the New York Wall Street Journal:

American aircraft industry bids for world leadership. Sees opportunity in current rush of orders to make permanent gains; avoids excess plant building; anticipates greater private-plane market due to pilot-training program and confidence of public because of recent safety records; this in turn will result in the establishment of the necessary airports.

From the New York Times of December 31, 1939:

UNITED STATES DIESELS FOR PLANES

(By Paul H. Wilkinson)

Two years ago it might have been said that the United States was in fourth place with regard to the development of the Diesel aircraft engine; now the picture has changed, and we have moved up to second place, partly due to our own efforts and partly due to the neglect of France and England in developing simplified aircraft Diesels along accepted lines.

From the Washington Post of January 4:

Noncollege students in the civilian pilot training program will be enrolled for ground-school work from noon until 9 p. m. today at Columbus, 1750 N Street NW.; ground school will open Thursday, January 11; details not yet settled.

We must also take into consideration that in addition to the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in the current year, the Authority is called upon to train at least 10,000 pilots during the coming year. That, of course, will be an added item of expense.

I have the following further clippings:

From the Los Angeles Times of December 24, 1939:

PLANE DEVICES UNDER TEST

Lewis L. Imm, former Bureau of Air Commerce inspector, experimenting with new devices at his Burbank factory. New devices consist of a "design computer," which will enable engineers to obtain maximum aeronautical efficiency out of planes in the making, and an "air mass computer," which will assist weather forecasters in correlating meteorological reports from all parts of the United States.

From the Washington Post of January 4:

VINSON ASKS 3,000 PLANES, 95 SHIPS, TO COST \$1,300,000,000

(By John G. Norris)

Naval Committee to consider measure Monday; Representative SNYDER, chairman of House Military Appropriations Subcommittee, urged that Army plane strength be enlarged from present goal of 5,500 to 8,000; minority member of House Naval Committee Representative MAAS favored 10,000 planes for Army and 6,000 for Navy, and a large reserve of pilots.

From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of January 4:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY GROUND-SCHOOL ENROLLMENT WILL OPEN TODAY AT COLUMBUS UNIVERSITY

Noncollege students in the civilian-pilot-training program will be enrolled for ground-school work from noon until 9 p. m. today at Columbus, 1750 N Street NW.; ground school will open Thursday, January 11; details not yet settled.

From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of January 4:

SUPERSPEED SHIP AWAITS ARMY TEST

Army will soon test new bomber which flies so fast it needs no escort; being manufactured by Vultee Aircraft Division of Aviation Manufacturing Corporation of Downey, Calif.

From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of January 4:

PAN AMERICAN ASKS DAILY TRANSATLANTIC CLIPPER SERVICE

Application filed with Civil Aeronautics Authority; new schedule would start in March; line has new \$5,000,000 fleet of super clippers under construction at Boeing Aircraft Co. plant in Seattle; officials emphasized that the new schedule would eliminate necessity for the line to request continuation of Government subsidies.

The following is from an editorial in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of December 21, 1939:

THE DEFENSE BILL

Accepting the evidence of the Gallup poll, 88 percent of the people are in favor of an immediate strengthening of the Army, 88 percent for strengthening of the Navy, and 91 percent for augmenting the air force; unquestionably the subject of national defense will be a main one before the present Congress.

Mr. President, in order to give the Senate some percentages in connection with this remarkable growth, let me very hurriedly call off these figures:

Revenue miles flown, taking 1937 as 100 percent, have increased in 1939 to 124 percent.

Total passengers carried, 100 percent in 1934; 173 percent in 1939.

Passenger-miles flown per passenger-fatality increased from 100 percent to 699 percent.

Value of aircraft put into service has increased 91 percent.

The number of employees, using 1937 as 100 percent, has increased to 133 percent in 1939.

This is one of the few industries of America which is employing more men each successive year even though the machine equipment is constantly improving. This is an industry that is really paying dividends to the Nation's economy.

Let me give a few additional percentages that reveal the stupendous improvement in this industry.

Passengers carried for the year ending June 30, 1935, one-half million. Passengers carried for the year ending June 30, 1939, one and a half million, representing an increase of 200 percent.

Pounds of mail—and this is the reason why, at least the older lines, are paying a profit to the Postal Service—pounds of mail carried in the year ending June 30, 1935, ten and a half million; pounds of mail carried in the year ending June 30, 1939, twenty-four and a half million, representing an increase of 130 percent.

Pounds of express carried, year ending June 30, 1935, two and a half million; year ending June 30, 1939, eight and a half million, representing an increase of 230 percent.

Pounds of excess baggage, year ending June 30, 1935, 900,000; year ending June 30, 1939, 2,000,000, an increase of 106 percent.

Revenues of air carriers 1935, \$23,000,000; 1939, \$47,000,000, an increase of 106 percent; expenses of air carriers 1935, \$26,000,000, which represented a loss of \$3,000,000; 1939, \$46,000,000, representing a profit of \$1,000,000.

Air-mail postage receipts, 1935, six and a half million dollars; 1939, sixteen and a quarter million dollars, representing an increase of 150 percent.

The increases were constant during the 5-year period, but were generally greater during the last fiscal year.

Mr. President, to indicate that the facilities covered by this bill are not for the exclusive purposes of commercial aviation, let me read a paragraph to the Senate:

The present teletype and associated interphone communication facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Authority directly serve 49 military airdromes located at various points throughout the United States.

Not only do they help in a military way but their contribution to agriculture is worthy of note. During the past year the United States Weather Bureau, by utilizing Civil Aeronautics Authority teletype service, have been able to extend and increase service to the general public including the farmers in a manner comparable to the services furnished the aviation industry.

At approximately 14 smaller towns the United States Weather Bureau has consolidated its city offices with its aerological airport offices, so that the Civil Aeronautics

Authority teletype circuits may be available to the general public, and this has resulted in an increase to the general public of service from a 12-hour basis to a 24-hour.

With the extended service being furnished on the Civil Aeronautics Authority teletype network over 50 of the larger city Weather Bureau offices have been furnished extensions of the teletype circuit. These extensions have permitted the city offices in the larger communities to give increased service and better forecasting, which information is transmitted to the general public and the farmers in the communities around these larger centers.

This information consists of a bare statement of facts, and the Weather Bureau feels that it can be amplified threefold without distorting the facts.

So agriculture is furnished the same service as that which is supplied to aviation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks certain additional statistics in reference to this subject.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

Aeronautical manufacturing

[Dec. 31 of each year]

	1937	1938	1939
Planes produced for domestic civil use.....	3,147	1,823	3,950
Planes exported (both civil and military).....	626	875	1,219
Planes produced for U. S. Air Corps and Navy.....	949	(1)	(1)
Total employees all United States aeronautical factories ¹	42,000	47,500	90,000
Total value of products all United States plane and engine factories.....	\$115,000,000	\$160,000,000	\$245,000,000
Total value all exports United States aeronautical products ²	39,395,000	68,227,000	117,081,000
Total value all unfilled orders for planes and engines.....	160,000,000	165,000,000	648,000,000

¹ Not available.

² Includes factories manufacturing accessories and instruments.

³ Includes accessories, parts, and parachutes.

Domestic air transport

[Index 1937=100]

	1937		1938		1939	
	Total	Index No.	Total	Index No.	Total	Index No.
Revenue-miles flown.....	66,071,507	100	69,668,827	105.4	82,554,239	124.9
Total passengers carried.....	1,102,707	100	1,343,427	121.8	1,912,051	173.4
Total passenger-miles flown.....	476,603,165	100	557,719,268	117.0	749,787,096	157.3
Express ton-miles flown.....	2,156,070	100	2,173,706	100.8	2,705,614	125.5
Mail ton-miles flown.....	6,698,230	100	7,422,860	110.8	9,100,000	135.9
Passenger-miles flown per passenger fatality.....	11,915,079	100	22,308,771	187.2	83,309,677	693.2
Miles flown per fatal accident.....	13,214,301	100	13,933,765	105.4	41,277,120	312.4
Value of aircraft put in service.....	\$3,734,000	100	\$1,899,000	50.8	\$3,402,000	91.1
Number of employees.....	11,586	100	13,309	114.9	15,420	133.1

Private flying

	1937	1938	1939
Number of civil planes.....	9,152	10,000	12,829
Number of civil pilots.....	17,681	22,983	31,264
Nonscheduled miles flown.....	102,996,355	129,359,999	175,000,000
Miles flown per fatal accident in nonscheduled flying.....	557,000	752,088	800,000

¹ Not including the 10,000 in student-training program.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in conclusion I desire to summarize by saying that we are discussing the air lanes as contrasted with the commercial air lines. We are discussing the air lanes that belong to the United States, and the facilities that make up the air lanes that are used by military, by commercial, and by private air lines and airships. We are discussing, Mr. President, an industry that cannot be fairly compared with any other industry for which any provision is made in any other appropriation bill. If an appropriation designed to aid a given industry were in a certain amount,

and if we took that as a basis for an argument for or against appropriations for the airplane industry, we would miss the point of the phenomenal growth of this industry in America. So I ask Senators to give consideration to the growth of the industry and to the fact that the air lanes are the property of the Government and are used not only by the air lines but by every form of every aviation activity.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been following the debate very carefully, and now, on behalf of those Members of the Senate who are overzealous, perhaps, in their enthusiasm for airways, I desire to say a few words with reference to the airways so ably described by the Senator from New York.

I believe that when there is developed a new industry, which has to do beneficially with the best interests of the country, it is false economy to cut down any appropriation that may aid in carrying it forward and in promoting its welfare.

I believe that possibly I have flown in airplanes about as much as has any other Member of this body, and I, for one, irrespective of other considerations, and with due deference to whatever action Congress may have heretofore taken in behalf of airways in this country, feel like paying a tribute to the hardy Americans who have made air navigation what it is today throughout the entire world.

Possibly we may not feel they have done very much, but I have reason to know some of the facts connected with the development of the airplane industry and with the airways in the United States.

As ably stated by the Senator from New York, there is not a single industry in the country that has made the progress or that has put more people to work during the days of the depression or recession, whatever one may want to call it, than has the airplane industry. It would do the heart of any Member of this body good to take a little time off and visit the airplane plant in Baltimore or one in southern California, whether it be at San Diego or at Los Angeles, or perhaps the one at Seattle, and there see young Americans by the thousands employed in a new industry, and lessening to that extent any demands by way of relief upon the Federal Government.

It was my good fortune during the latter part of November and the early part of December last year, in company with the Senator from Indiana, who is now presiding with such ability and dignity [Mr. MINTON in the chair], with the Senator on my left from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], to fly over many parts of the United States and to obtain first-hand information as to the possibilities of the development of this industry which is growing so rapidly and which means so much not only to the economic life of the United States but in times of emergency to the defense of the Nation.

I, for one, confess that I am overenthusiastic about airplanes and airways. While I feel that we should cut the expenses of government, I still think that it is false economy to reduce appropriations which affect those things that are absolutely necessary in this time and age. I may also add that I am so "sold" on the work performed by young Americans who have made the world air-minded and who have actually carried to other climes the so-called good-will policy of the Federal Government that I want to pay them tribute. I will state to this body that the Pan American Airways have brought about more good will in South America in a few short years than have a hundred years of discussion by so-called diplomats, and the Pan American Airways are still carrying forward that good work. Let us not try to hamper aviation; let us not try to hamper the airplane industry by cutting down in a direction that may mean—and I have good reason personally to know whereof I speak—the crippling of the industry.

The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Nevada have referred to the death in an airplane accident of my predecessor, the late Senator Cutting. I wish to goodness there had been available at that time the weather information and the inspection which has since been made possible, so that he could be in this body instead of me. I still feel

that it was the lack of weather information, and possibly of inspection, which caused his death. So why not try to save human life, whether it be the life of a United States Senator or of an ordinary American citizen? What would be accomplished by hampering the industry, which would be the result if the appropriation were reduced a million dollars? Would that be saving the Government? Would that balance the Budget? All it would do would be to retard the progress of a great industry.

I thank the Senate.

CENSUS QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall not speak on the pending amendment to the bill before us; but I shall speak in answer to Hon. Harry Hopkins, Secretary of Commerce of the United States, replying to a letter which he wrote me and which was received last night, in reply to one of mine sent to him a few days ago, which I read on the floor of the Senate on February 1.

On February 1 I read to this body a letter, dated January 31, which I had written to Secretary Hopkins, of the Department of Commerce; and this letter appears on page 887 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1.

In my letter to Mr. Hopkins I said that in the light of evidence found by the Sheppard investigating committee in the W. P. A. scandal, where official, confidential information was divulged by W. P. A. officials to Democratic political bosses, I felt that there was real danger to our individual citizens in forcing them, under the population census, under threat of a penalty of imprisonment, to divulge to the politically appointed census enumerators information concerning the individual citizen's income and indebtedness; and I urged that questions concerning a man's or a woman's private income be eliminated from the questionnaire.

Mr. Hopkins has written me a letter dated February 3, 1940, which purports to be a reply to the points which I raised, but which in reality is nothing but a confession and avoidance, and a clear disposition to retain these questions concerning income of the individual citizen.

I now read this letter to you:

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: This is in reply to your letter of January 31 in which you characterize certain questions to be asked in the approaching census as departures from precedent and invasions of the privacy of the individual.

Surely you know that the census is 150 years old this year—one of the oldest activities of the Federal Government—that it was provided for in the United States Constitution; and that it has been taken every 10 years since 1790. Surely you know that, almost throughout this Nation's entire life, the census has provided the basic facts for democratic guidance not only of individuals and public officials at all levels, but also of agriculture and industry. The census has survived and grown stronger through all sorts of political administrations, because it is so designed, and has been so continued, as to command the continued respect and confidence of a free people. Any sincere public official should regret seeing this long and splendid record damaged for purely partisan, political reasons, and that is why I am replying to you at such length.

To the foregoing I now reply:

Yes; we all know that the census is 150 years old this year, and I know that never before in the 150 years' history of the census has any question ever been asked of the individual by politically appointed enumerators as to how much income a man made.

We also know that the census was provided for in the Constitution of the United States. That is nothing new; but I go farther than merely stating the fact that the census is provided for in the United States Constitution. Article 1, section 2, of the Constitution says:

The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

That is, in such manner as the Congress directs—not Harry Hopkins, bureaucrat.

The Bureau of the Census receives its authority to take the present decennial census from the National Census Act of June 18, 1929. This act stipulates that the census—

shall be restricted to inquiries relating to population, to agriculture, to irrigation, drainage, distribution, employment, and mines.

Nowhere in this act is authority granted for questions regarding a man's personal income.

Yes; the census is provided for in the United States Constitution, but the Constitution restricts it to be carried out in such manner as the Congress by law shall direct, and not otherwise.

I now resume reading from Mr. Hopkins' letter:

Your entire discussion of the census is based upon misconception of it. First: You write as if census questions concerning home mortgages were new this year. The truth is that 50 years ago, in 1890, such questions were first included in the census during the Republican administration of President Benjamin Harrison and these questions were specifically ordered by Congress. I quote the exact language of the law: "That it shall be the duty of the Superintendent of the Census, in addition to the duties now required of him by law, to ascertain the number of persons who live on and cultivate their own farms and who live in their own homes and the number who hire their homes and farms and the number of farms and homes which are under mortgage, the amount of mortgage debt, and the value of the property mortgaged. He shall also ascertain whether such farms and homes have been mortgaged for the whole or part of the purchase money for the same or for other purposes and the rates of interest paid upon the mortgage loans."

Questions concerning this same subject—value of nonfarm homes, mortgage debt and rate of interest—again were included in the census of 1920.

Indeed, this whole furore about personal questions in 1940 is absurd. I can well imagine how much more vivid your complaint would be if it were proposed that in 1940, each person be asked to state the value of all the real estate he owns and the value of all other property he owns. We are not asking these questions, but the first of them was asked by the Whigs in the census of 1850, under President Zachary Taylor.

Both of them were asked in 1860 and 1870 under the Democratic President Buchanan and the Republican President Grant.

As to asking people who rent their homes the amount of rent they pay, that question was first placed in the census list in 1930 under President Hoover.

Yes; questions concerning home mortgages were asked back in 1890, but Mr. Hopkins apparently did not understand my objection. My objection is based upon the fact that never before in the history of this country has the Nation witnessed the shameful betrayal of trust by politically appointed Government workers carried on on a national scale under the W. P. A. scandal. In the light of this picture, where secret official files were turned over to party bosses to be used to coerce voters to vote against their convictions and to throw off the relief rolls those who insisted upon maintaining their principles in voting, the people are reasonably justified in being apprehensive about being forced, under penalty of imprisonment, to inform their politically appointed neighbors whether their homes are mortgaged, and, if so, how much the secured indebtedness is and whether payments are being made from time to time on it.

I could read for hours on the Senate floor of facts found by the Sheppard investigating committee and others that have come to my attention at first hand, in my own State of New Hampshire, of instances in which coercion was used on W. P. A. workers.

I resume reading from Mr. Hopkins' letter:

Second. You express alarm over the fact that the answer of census questions is compulsory. The truth is that the laws have contained penalties for refusals to answer these questions ever since the first census in 1790 and that no one has complained seriously, and no one has been penalized, because the American people on the whole recognize the basic value of this work.

Third. You create an impression that the 1940 census is something new and strange which shatters precedent and somehow carries a threat of dictatorship. The truth is that the law under which the 1940 census will be taken, with the single exception of the housing schedule, is the Fifteenth Census Act, sponsored and recommended to Congress by Herbert Hoover while he was Secretary of Commerce, and enacted while he was President. Except for the supplementary census of housing, no new decennial census legislation has been enacted since Mr. Hoover left the White House. On this point let me quote Representative E. Hart Fenn, chairman of the House Census Committee, as he opened the hearings on the Fifteenth Census Act on January 11, 1928:

"Before I came to Washington I communicated with the Secretary of Commerce and the Census Bureau * * * and this bill was referred to me by Mr. Hoover. * * * It is what I may characterize as the bill which the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census consider advisable to be adopted for the taking of the Fifteenth Decennial Census."

Much of what I have just read is a repetition of the first part of the letter. That this is the Fifteenth Census Act is

not disputed, and never has been. This fact places the more emphasis upon the departure of the Census Bureau by its inclusion of questions Nos. 32 and 33, which demand that the individual citizen reveal to his politically appointed neighbor how much income he has earned for the past year. Mr. Hopkins' reference to the 1929 authorization act avoids mention of the fact that this act places definite restrictions upon the Census Bureau, which restrictions have been ignored by the Census Bureau by the insertion of the income questions. Never before has it been compulsory for a person to reveal such information in such a manner, and there is no law requiring a citizen to do it now; merely the dictum of Harry Hopkins.

Further, Mr. Hopkins writes:

Fourth. The method of selecting enumerators, which is in force today, is such an old and traditional method, having been concurred in by both political parties for longer than the memory of any living man, that it needs no comment from me.

Well, we will answer Mr. Hopkins on that point.

"Old and traditional method," Mr. Hopkins? In this spoils system of selecting these 130,000 census enumerators without regard to merit, but solely on political patronage basis, you excuse the administration's continuing this practice on the ground that it is an old and traditional method. Have you forgotten, and has the administration forgotten, that back in 1932 its campaign criers covered the country from Alaska to Florida, from Maine to California, and promised the people a new deal? And yet, once seizing power, you hold to the old and traditional method of discriminating against the people and forget that promise of a new deal. The people cannot forget.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I certainly will yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Do I correctly understand the Senator from New Hampshire that his complaint upon this particular ground is that the Democrats are doing just what the Republicans did?

Mr. TOBEY. Oh, no. If the Senator will retain his seat a few minutes longer, I will tell him what I am driving at.

When the New Deal first came into power many of the deluded of this country thought the administration would be the tree of liberty. That tree has accomplished many strange things. The most wonderful thing about it is the amount of grafting it has been able to survive.

Has Mr. Hopkins forgotten, or is he ignoring, the position taken by prominent Members of this body when he holds to the old order, and refuses to select these enumerators on the basis of merit rather than to pay a political debt?

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], speaking on the Senate floor, unequivocally assured the people where he stands on this issue when he said:

In my judgment, it is a great step backward to undertake the important work of obtaining a correct census of the people and of the activities of the citizens of the United States without having the very best possible employees selected. * * * In the instances where the census was taken by civil-service appointees, the results have been, in the main, satisfactory; when the census was taken under a system other than that of appointments by merit, there has been a certain amount of maladministration and, in some instances, grave inaccuracies, if not absolute frauds. This important governmental undertaking should be removed from every scintilla of corruption, extravagance, inaccuracy, and abuse that it is possible to eliminate. * * * Every experience of the past prompts us, if we want an honest and reliable count and prevent the wastefulness resulting from incompetent officials, to appoint census takers under civil service. * * * I want to protest vigorously and emphatically against the census being taken merely upon the basis of political favor, partisan patronage, and party reward.

Well said, Senator WALSH!

Mr. Hugo Black—surely Senators have not forgotten him—once a Member of this body, and now a Justice on our Supreme Court, and a most prominent member of the Democratic Party, in a speech on this floor, gave this expression of his sentiments to the people. I quote his words:

Who fills the ranks of this (census) army? Who appoints the supervisors? The Director of the Census, through political channels. Who appoints the supervisors' clerks? The Director of the

Census through political channels. Who appoints the interpreters and public agents? The Director of the Census through political channels. And who is this almighty and all-powerful Director of the Census? He is the political appointee of the President.

Step back and look at this creation in its true perspective. You have evolved an instrumentality of patronage and politics of gigantic proportions. And you have placed a controlling lever in the hands of the President without imposing upon him any responsibility. * * * Is there no method superior to the spoils system? Have we never heard of the merit system? It has been developed and improved and perfected during the last half century. Is it really necessary that we resort to the refuse heap of discredited and discarded government devices, where the spoils system lingers in its rotten state, and drag it out into the main hall of government?

Those were the sentiments of former Senator Black, uttered on this floor.

And the able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] who has my great admiration, made known his views in the following language:

It is said that time is short; that the Civil Service Commission cannot make the appointments in the length of time available. The time will be just as long for the Civil Service Commission to do it as for the politicians to do it. God is not going to keep the sun from going down in order to give the politicians more time, and shove it behind the clouds if the Civil Service Commission shall do it. The time is going to be just the same, short I admit, too short to do a really efficient job perhaps, but the Civil Service Commission is equipped to make appointments without regard for politics, but the political machine is equipped to make appointments with nothing else in view except politics. We must take one horn of the dilemma or the other. * * * If a man can convince the boss that he is able to get the most votes, that he is the best politician in his community, he is going to get the job. * * *

I continue reading Mr. Hopkins' letter:

I make these political references with the utmost reluctance and only because your letter forces me to do so. The census, an established and valued American institution, should not be made the butt of partisan political sniping. Its questions are its own. They are the questions to which large and responsible groups of American citizens are demanding the answer.

Now, where do the questions come from? The Census Bureau calls together at conference after conference representatives of business, industry, and labor, and all other large groups primarily interested. They sift down a multitude of questions, always seeking to reduce the number to a few of the most basic and broadly significant. Literally thousands of questions have been reviewed during the past year—many of them useful questions—so as not to burden the people.

Then, these questions are further sifted by the Central Statistical Board of the Bureau of the Budget, and finally by the Census Advisory Committee, a group of widely known experts from outside Government circles. This committee includes Robert D. Chaddock, of Columbia University; Dr. J. Frederick Dewhurst, of Twentieth Century Fund; Paul T. Cherrington, market analyst; Dr. William F. Ogburn, of the University of Chicago; Dr. William L. Thorpe, of Dun & Bradstreet and economic adviser to the Secretary of Commerce; and Dr. Murray R. Benedict, of the University of California.

Thus these questions will be, as far as the Census Bureau can ascertain by vast labor and pains, the wishes of the American people.

In fact, the questions on the population schedule were tried out with nearly 2,000 persons in the Indiana test census, and the questions on earnings were answered with very little hesitancy. What hesitancy was displayed came chiefly from the higher-income groups, whose objections vanished when they learned that all they needed to state was "over \$5,000."

I point out that that is misleading. There is no provision in the law for this question on the blank regarding a limitation about \$5,000. The question is: "What is the amount of money wages or salary received (including commissions)." Did this person receive income of \$50 or more from sources other than money wages or salary? And you have to answer those questions as they are put.

Mr. Hopkins contends that the questions in these census schedules represent the wishes of the American people. Not according to my files; not according to the letters and telephone calls I am receiving from hundreds of justly apprehensive men and women who are concerned to learn that they will be forced, under threat of imprisonment, to divulge their incomes to politically appointed neighbors, who are concerned in the light of the activities of betrayal of confidence during the recent W. P. A. scandal. As a single illustration, I read from a letter which I received just the other day from a woman in New York State:

On a recent news broadcast I heard an item which told of your interest in and opposition to questions in the census. This comes to me with much force because of experiences I have had. One was during a recent farm census, when I was obliged to tell a neighbor, who had been made census taker, if I had a mortgage and how much. This is a small town, and this information was a sweet morsel for the census taker, who lost no time in letting it be known. For such as I am, whose honest endeavor is to live a square and decent life and mind my own business, these things hurt cruelly and seem most unjust. I hope you will continue to push this matter; and if the above will be of use to you in so doing, use it, but kindly do not mention my name, as I very much dislike publicity, and my health demands I keep as quiet as possible.

No; these questions regarding income do not represent the wishes of the American people.

Mr. Hopkins continues in his letter as follows:

If, however, there should be objectors among those of lower incomes, it must be said that the law prescribes severe penalties—\$1,000 fine or 2 years in prison, or both—for any census taker who reveals any of this personal information. Throughout the long history of the Bureau there have been very few cases of it.

I do not feel that this penalty provision will prove any more of an impediment to the divulging of his neighbor's income by a politically appointed census enumerator than was the penalty provision contained in the Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1938, which imposed the following restrictions and penalties on W. P. A. political appointees:

Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project, employment, or relief aid under the appropriations in this title, or diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriation or any services or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination, on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in the labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriation, or attempts to so do, or assists in so doing, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

That this penalty of a fine of \$2,000 or imprisonment up to a year was no effective impediment to betrayal of confidences by W. P. A. officials is well established in the record of the report of the Sheppard investigating committee. Throughout the Nation confidential files were secretly handed over to political bosses, and political bosses used the information to deny relief to those who refused to vote against their convictions and support particular candidates at the polls. The record is filled with instances of coercion and betrayal of confidence, even in the face of such a penalty provision contained in the statute.

What assurance, then, is the penalty provision in the Census Act, that the private information of the individual will not be divulged to a man's neighbor-politician?

I continue reading Mr. Hopkins' letter:

Your views on the housing census apparently have been formed without knowledge of the census and are out of step with the wishes of the American people. Literally, thousands of large business and industrial interests and associations, along with groups of many other types, want the picture of American housing. The builder cannot take the risk of large operations without knowledge of the census. This is a situation which has been known for years to any person who cared to read about current affairs. The files of the Census Bureau are full of requests for this information. Your fears about the invasion of people's privacy and about the widespread misuse of this confidential information by the census taker will hold up only as long as you labor under the delusion that this activity is something new. This, of course, is completely false. There is almost unlimited experience to prove that the American people are willing to cooperate in providing the facts sought by the census and to prove further that census enumerators, with very rare exceptions, respect the confidence entrusted to them. The census is not essentially different from decade to decade. A few new questions are added each time, out of the experience of the immediate past, but the same general method applied to your parents and your grandparents, now applies to you. Yet, can you recall any important outcry concerning misuse of census information in your entire lifetime?

Can I recall any important outcries concerning misuse of census information in my entire lifetime? Yes; I can. Many of them, and here they are, Mr. Hopkins.

I have already read the letter I received from a woman in New York, whose trust was betrayed by a census enumerator. My other authorities are great and numerous, and they come from important sources.

The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] could answer Mr. Hopkins better than I could, and I will use his words:

Will you forget what happened in prior censuses—how, in 1910, corruption and fraud and graft were revealed upon the part of many of the enumerators in this country? * * * There was much fraud and corruption in 1910, but the reports do state that they were not so glaring and so frequent as in 1900.

I further answer Mr. Hopkins in the following words of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]:

We are face to face with the issue whether or not we are going to repeat the frauds and scandals which have occurred in the taking of previous censuses by selecting census employees, nearly 100,000 of them, on the basis of political favor.

I further answer Mr. Hopkins by using the words of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]:

The Senator referred to the Maryland case, and I take it the Senator recalls that the enumerators appointed who were guilty of the fraud to which the Senator referred were appointed as a result of the spoils system—that is, merely upon the recommendation of political leaders, without any reference to the civil-service law.

I now answer Mr. Hopkins in the words of the Federal grand jury which investigated the Maryland fraud cases. After disclosing the frauds, the grand jury said:

So long as such appointments are treated as parts of the spoils of politics, the recurrence of such frauds and scandals as have been revealed in our investigations may be expected to continue.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has already answered Mr. Hopkins' question, and I quote his words:

Our experience in the past teaches us that where the census has been taken under the spoils system, there have always been great abuses. There will be great abuses in this instance. If, for instance, the Director of the Census may delegate to the supervisor authority to appoint enumerators, and if they are appointed entirely from the political standpoint, unquestionably there will be great abuses.

I continue reading Mr. Hopkins' letter:

The whole theory of democracy is based upon confidence in the individual and in his willingness to cooperate, in proper fields, for the common good. I have faith both in the people who are asking these questions and those who are answering them.

I answer, Yes, Mr. Hopkins; the people will be willing to cooperate in proper fields. You say you have faith in the people who are asking and answering these questions. Such optimism on the part of one who headed that great nationwide organization of W. P. A. in that period in our history where betrayal after betrayal of secret trust, and coercion after coercion was demonstrated by those who served under him, to the detriment of needy men and women who, through no fault of their own, were denied the sustenance of life merely because they refused to resign their convictions in favor of certain political candidates.

I now read the remainder of Mr. Hopkins' letter:

The one thing which might do serious harm, the one thing that might do serious violence to the 1940 census and thus to the national welfare, would be the wide circulation of false charges that it is something new and fearsome. I assure you that it represents no departure from precedent, either in the law under which it operates or the mechanics by which it is carried out. The 1940 census, as in the past, finds us taking the regular inventory of democracy in action.

Sincerely,

HARRY HOPKINS,
Secretary of Commerce.

That is a misleading and a false statement, as I have pointed out. He reads into that law questions that are not permitted by the law, and I throw the statement back at him.

Mr. President, the contention that the inquisition regarding the amount of income of the individual is not new is not true. This is admitted by the Bureau of the Census in its general information sheet which was sent to me by the

Bureau of the Census yesterday. On page 2 thereof is the following:

It will, for the first time, seek information on the amount of wages or salaries for the past 12 months.

And please contrast this with Harry Hopkins' assertion that there is no change.

Mr. President, it not only represents a departure from precedent as admitted by the census information sheet but as denied by Mr. Hopkins, but it is clearly, as I have pointed out previously, a violation of the law under which it operates, which law places restrictions as to the scope of information to be secured by the Census Bureau. By going beyond the provision of the law in its inclusion of income questions, the Bureau of the Census sets itself up as a law-making body. This it has no right to do.

No less prominent a personage than Justice Hugo Black, formerly a Member of this body, has expressed his view of bureaucratic lawmaking in the following language:

Several bureaus that have the power of promulgating rules and regulations, for a violation of which a man can be sent to jail, and can be subjected to punishment as though he had violated a legally written statute of this Government, several bureaus which have the powers and privileges of lawmaking bodies * * *. Why is that? It is because Congress, from time to time, has let fall from its enfeebled grasp the power which the fathers of this Government intended should be lodged in the legislative powers and authorities. * * * We have a bureau that declares a rule, for instance, that he who permits a fly to be on his premises shall be put to death and their rule becomes a law. Bureau upon top of bureau, bureau on top of bureau, until they pile up, towering into the sky, each one emitting rules and rules and rules like the volcano belches forth its smoke, until the average citizen is lost in the meshes of the multitudinous laws, rules, and regulations more than he ever dreamed he could be.

Mr. President, several years ago when he was Administrator of the W. P. A., it was reported that Mr. Hopkins made the following statement:

The people are just too damn dumb to understand what is going on.

Mr. Hopkins, the people are not too dumb this time to understand what is going on. At least they will not be when the census enumerator calls at their houses and asks them how much income they have made during the past year. They will recognize an unjustified inquisition when they see it.

Mr. President, I am very much in earnest in this matter. I have received hundreds of letters and telephone calls from conscientious people of all classes, and I am interested particularly in the little man who may be intimidated and coerced by the appearance of the official census taker, who will ask questions about income which have not been authorized by the Congress.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to submit the following Senate resolution, which I will read to you and send to the desk. This resolution (S. Res. 231) reads as follows:

Whereas section 4 of the act of June 18, 1929 (providing for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses), provides that "the fifteenth and subsequent censuses shall be restricted to inquires relating to population, to agriculture, to irrigation, to drainage, to distribution, to unemployment, and to mines"; and

Whereas the act of August 11, 1939 (providing for a national census of housing), extends the scope of the population inquiry of the sixteenth decennial census to include the obtaining of information with respect to dwelling structures and dwelling units in the United States; and

Whereas neither of the acts aforementioned nor any other act of Congress authorizes the officers and employees of the United States charged with the duty of taking the sixteenth decennial census to make inquiries with respect to income; and

Whereas notwithstanding the absence of authority to make inquiries with respect to income, questions 32 and 33 on the forms prepared by the Bureau of the Census to be used by the enumerators in taking the Sixteenth Census are as follows:

"Amount of money wages or salary received (including commissions) (1939).

"Did this person receive income of \$50 or more from sources other than money wages or salary?" (1939); and

Whereas no justification can exist for officers and employees of the United States to lawfully arrogate to themselves the power to make unauthorized inquiries into the private affairs of citizens; and

Whereas it is particularly dangerous for officers and employees of the United States to abuse their authority in cases where citizens

may tolerate such abuse of authority because of their fear of being prosecuted criminally: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Director of the Census and the Secretary of Commerce should immediately cause to be deleted from the population schedule proposed to be used in taking the sixteenth census inquiries 32 and 33 now appearing upon such proposed schedule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] will be received and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Do I understand the Senator to say that there is no act of Congress or statute which gives it as the sense of Congress that the census form should contain a question concerning income?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Then this is being done on the personal initiative of the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. TOBEY. Beyond peradventure.

Mr. LODGE. I venture the guess that if that were understood widely the American people would consider it high-handed and outrageous.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the Senator is quite correct. We have a little over 120,000,000 people in this country, most of whom are what is called the great working class or middle class of people. The home life of America is represented by them. Perhaps they do not know so much about the matter of balancing the Budget or the question of foreign debts or tariff matters. But they do know that they are up against the guns when there is an inquisitorial campaign on, when political snoopers come around and ask these questions they have no right to ask under the law, and I predict right now that if they are persisted in you will get the greatest backwash of righteous indignation that you ever witnessed in America.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I suggest that if we continue as we have in the past in debating this item the body will not even get a million dollars to spend.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from New Hampshire include questions 32 and 33, which he has discussed?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; just those two questions.

Mr. LUCAS. And those two questions are the only ones that the Senator, as I understand, is complaining about.

Mr. TOBEY. I am more outraged by those than the others, but particularly those, because they are not provided for by statute, and they are entirely de novo in this questionnaire.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, as I understand, the two questions, 32 and 33, are the only new ones that have been included in the questionnaire by the Secretary of Commerce in the taking of the census.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I return to a certain portion of the letter written by Mr. Hopkins to the distinguished Senator. On page 2 he says:

As to asking people who rent their homes the amount of rent they pay, that question was first placed in the census list in 1930 under President Hoover.

Does the Senator agree that that is true?

Mr. TOBEY. I will accept that at par.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what the Senator means by accepting the question "at par."

Mr. TOBEY. I will accept it at its face value.

Mr. LUCAS. The only question that I am concerned about in connection with that statement is whether or not the Senator from New Hampshire agrees to that.

Mr. TOBEY. I agree to that.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator thinks it is a good thing for the census enumerators to find out what the tenant is paying for rent.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is putting words in my mouth. I said I agree with that statement of Harry Hopkins that it was done under Mr. Hoover.

Mr. LUCAS. I am asking the Senator whether he agrees that it is a good thing in connection with taking the census for the census enumerator to find out from the tenant what he is paying in rent?

Mr. TOBEY. I do not think he should by any means; no.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words that is about on a par with asking a man what his income is?

Mr. TOBEY. It is next door to it.

Mr. LUCAS. There is not much difference between ascertaining what my income is and what the poor tenant has to pay for the rent of his home?

Mr. TOBEY. And how often he makes payment, and when he made the last payment, and so forth and so forth ad nauseam.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum, with the view of seeing if we cannot get a vote after getting a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	La Follette	Reed
Andrews	Frazier	Lee	Reynolds
Austin	George	Lodge	Russell
Barbour	Gerry	Lucas	Schwartz
Barkley	Gibson	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Bridges	Glass	McCarran	Sheppard
Brown	Green	McKellar	Smathers
Bulow	Guffey	McNary	Smith
Burke	Gurney	Maloney	Stewart
Byrd	Hale	Mead	Taft
Byrnes	Harrison	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Hatch	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Hayden	Murray	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Herring	Norris	Townsend
Clark, Mo.	Hill	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Danaher	Holt	Overton	Walsh
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wheeler
Donahey	King	Pittman	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 9.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURKE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). I announce that my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is unavoidably absent because of illness. I am not authorized to say how he would vote on this question.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is unavoidably detained on official business. I promised him that if he could not return to the Senate in time to participate in the vote I would protect him. I am informed that if present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote because of a pair.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. TYDINGS. I announce that my colleague [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is detained from the Senate on important business.

Mr. LUCAS. My colleague [Mr. SLATTERY] is absent on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] has a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If my colleague [Mr. HOLMAN] were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (after having voted in the affirmative). I had not noticed the absence from the Chamber of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I am advised, however, that he would vote as I have voted. I therefore will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. McNARY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. If present, I am informed that he would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Dowell, of Iowa.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—34

Adams	George	Lodge	Stewart
Barkley	Gerry	Lucas	Taft
Bridges	Glass	McKellar	Tobey
Brown	Hale	Maloney	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Miller	Tydings
Burke	Hayden	Reed	Walsh
Byrd	Herring	Russell	White
Byrnes	Holt	Sheppard	
Capper	Lee	Smith	

NAYS—37

Andrews	Frazier	McCarran	Reynolds
Austin	Gibson	McNary	Schwartz
Barbour	Green	Mead	Schwellenbach
Chavez	Guffey	Minton	Smathers
Clark, Idaho	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	Hatch	Norris	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	
Donahey	La Follette	Pepper	
Ellender	Lundeen	Pittman	

NOT VOTING—25

Ashurst	Connally	Neely	Vandenberg
Bailey	Downey	Nye	Van Nuys
Bankhead	Gillette	Radcliffe	Wagner
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead	Wiley
Bone	Hughes	Slattery	
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho	
Chandler	King	Truman	

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Missouri on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 13, after the word "skis" and the parenthesis, to strike out "\$2,420,000" and insert "\$2,406,520", so as to read:

Safety regulation: For all expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title VI of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and all other provisions of said act relating to safety regulation, except air-traffic control, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of witnesses, including expert witnesses; employment of attorneys and examiners on a fee basis (not to exceed \$7,500); salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation; purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair and overhaul of aircraft; purchase and exchange (not to exceed \$29,200), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; special wearing apparel and equipment (including snowshoes and skis), \$2,406,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 2, after the word "of" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$2,000,000", so as to read:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acquisition and establishment of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of additional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; and for the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease or grant, \$5,265,280, of which amount \$2,000,000 shall be available for the payment of contractual obligations authorized to be incurred prior to July 1, 1940: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Administrator may, prior to July 1, 1941, enter into contracts for the purchase, construction, and installation of additional air-navigation facilities not in excess of \$2,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 15, to reduce the total appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Authority from \$27,900,693 to \$26,721,954.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that the total at that point will have to be changed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the necessity of changing the total because of the action of the Senate in rejecting the committee amendment on page 9, line 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will be authorized to correct the totals.

The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission", on page 13, line 21, after the word "including", to insert "not to exceed \$25,040 for the work heretofore performed by the Council of Personnel Administration and"; and on page 14, line 22, after the word "for", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,975,000, of which not to exceed \$175,000 shall be available for reimbursement of the Veterans' Administration for services rendered the Commission in connection with physical examinations of applicants for and the employees in the Federal classified service", so as to read:

For three Commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including personal services required for examination of Presidential postmasters, and including not to exceed \$25,040 for the work heretofore performed by the Council of Personnel Administration and not to exceed \$2,500 for employment of expert examiners not in the Federal service on special subjects for which examiners within the service are not available, and for personal services in the field; for medical examinations; for necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the Commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses incident to attendance at meetings concerned with problems of public officials, educational groups, Government employees as such, and other similar organizations, which are peculiar to the interests and business of the Commission, when specifically directed by the Commission; for furniture and other equipment and repairs thereto; rental of equipment; supplies; advertising; telegraph, telephone, and laundry service; freight and express charges; streetcar fares not to exceed \$300; stationery; purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, directories, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, not to exceed \$10,000; charts; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motortrucks, motorcycles, and bicycles; garage rent; postage stamps to prepay postage on matter addressed to Postal Union countries; special-delivery stamps; and other like miscellaneous necessary expenses not hereinbefore provided for, \$4,975,000, of which not to exceed \$175,000 shall be available for

reimbursement of the Veterans' Administration for services rendered the Commission in connection with physical examinations of applicants for and the employees in the Federal classified service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, to reduce the total appropriation for the Civil Service Commission from \$97,266,000 to \$97,241,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission", on page 18, line 22, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$2,091,340" and insert "\$2,051,340", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For seven Commissioners, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Communications Commission in performing the duties imposed by the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), the Ship Act of 1910, approved June 24, 1910, as amended (46 U. S. C. 484-487), the International Radiotelegraphic Convention (45 Stat., pt. 2, p. 2760), Executive Order No. 3513, dated July 9, 1921, as amended under date of June 30, 1934, relating to applications for submarine cable licenses, and the radio-telegraphy provisions of the Convention for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea, ratified by the President of the United States, July 7, 1936, including personal services, contract stenographic reporting services, rental of quarters, newspapers, periodicals, reference books, law books, special counsel fees, supplies and equipment, including purchase and exchange of instruments, which may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$25; improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings, not to exceed \$5,000, purchase and exchange (not to exceed \$15,000), maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in the field, travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings which in the discretion of the Commission are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities, reimbursement to ships of the United States for charges incurred by such ships in transmitting information in compliance with section 357 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, expenses of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household goods and other personal effects (not to exceed in any case 5,000 pounds) of officers and employees when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty upon specific authorization by the Commission, \$2,051,340, of which amount not to exceed \$1,246,340 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, including compensation of employees of the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 3, to reduce the total appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission from \$2,116,340 to \$2,076,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Loan Agency—Electric Home and Farm Authority", on page 21, line 20, after the word "expenses", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1941, by the Authority shall be considered as non-administrative expenses for the purposes hereof", so as to read:

Electric Home and Farm Authority, salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed \$600,000 of the funds of the Electric Home and Farm Authority, established as an agency of the Government by Executive Order No. 7139 of August 12, 1935, and continued as such agency until June 30, 1941, by the act of March 4, 1939 (Public Act No. 2, 76th Cong.), shall be available during the fiscal year 1941 for administrative expenses of the Authority, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821-833); not exceeding \$3,000 for expenses incurred in packing, crating, and transporting household effects (not exceeding 5,000 pounds in any one case) of personnel when transferred in the interest of the service from one official station to another for permanent duty when specifically authorized in the order directing the transfer; printing and binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed \$200 for periodicals, newspapers, and maps; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and all other administrative expenses: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or

collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1941, by the Authority shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home Owners' Loan Corporation", on page 29, line 23, after the word "expenses", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That all necessary expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof", so as to read:

Not to exceed \$22,000,000 of the funds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, established by the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 128), shall be available during the fiscal year 1941 for administrative expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821-833); expenses (not to exceed \$3,500) of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Corporation when specifically authorized by the Board of Directors; printing and binding; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed \$500 for periodicals and newspapers; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; use of the services and facilities of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Federal home-loan banks, and Federal Reserve banks; and all other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 34, line 21, after the word "expenses" and the colon, to strike out "Not to exceed a total of \$200,000 from the funds herein-after made available to the agencies placed under the general direction and supervision of the Federal Works Administrator by part 3 of Reorganization Plan Numbered I, shall be transferred, as directed by such Administrator, to this paragraph, and be available for", and insert "For", and on page 35, line 21, after the word "laws", to insert the following proviso: "Provided, That the Administrator in order to effectuate part 3 of Reorganization Plan Numbered I submitted and approved pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1939 may transfer to this appropriation from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units of the Federal Works Agency such sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator of any of the administrative functions of said constituent units", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For salaries in the Office of the Administrator in the District of Columbia, including the salary of a General Consul at \$10,000 per annum, and other expenses of said Office, including printing and binding (not to exceed \$8,000); actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses to persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Administrator; purchase (including exchange) of law books and other books of reference, periodicals, and press clippings; not to exceed \$700 for the purchase of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; not to exceed \$1,500 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Administrator, at meetings or conventions relating to the work of the Agency; not to exceed \$10,000 for the employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, for special services determined by the Administrator to be necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and the civil-service and classification laws, \$250,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator in order to effectuate part 3 of Reorganization Plan No. I submitted and approved pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1939 may transfer to this appropriation from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units of the Federal Works Agency such sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator of any of the administrative functions of said constituent units.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings Administration", on page 40, line 11, before the word "of", to strike out "\$8,963,245" and insert "\$8,938,245", so as to read:

Salaries and general expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia maintained and operated by the Public Buildings Administration, including the National Archives Building; repair, preservation, and equipment of the Treasury Annex, city post office, Auditors' Building, Liberty Loan Building, and customhouse; per diem employees at rates of pay approved by the Commissioner of Public Buildings, not exceeding current rates for similar services in the District of Columbia, and such employees in emergencies may be entered on duty subject to confirmation by the Federal Works Administrator; rent of buildings; demolition of buildings; expenses incident to moving various executive departments and establishments in connection with the assignment, allocation, transfer, and survey of building space; traveling expenses and carfare; leather and rubber articles and gas masks for the protection of public property and employees; furnishings and equipment; arms and ammunition for the guard force; not exceeding \$40,090 for purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; and the purchase of two motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; \$8,938,245, of which amount not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for major repairs and improvements to public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal-aid highway system", on page 44, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,120,000" and insert "\$1,110,000"; in line 5, before the word "to", to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$99,990,000"; and in line 9, after the numerals "633" and the parenthesis, to insert "less \$10,000 transferred to the Federal Works Administrator for the administrative expenses of his office", so as to read:

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355-359), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, including not to exceed \$1,110,000 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, \$99,990,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1940 by section 1 of the act approved June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 633), less \$10,000 transferred to the Federal Works Administrator for the administrative expenses of his office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 16, to reduce the total appropriation for the Public Roads Administration from \$141,000,000 to \$140,990,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Works Administration", on page 48, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,610,000" and insert "\$3,585,000", so as to read:

Not to exceed \$3,585,000 of the funds appropriated by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 shall be available for administrative expenses of said Administration, which administrative expenses shall include personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821-833); printing and binding; purchase including exchange of lawbooks, and books of reference, and not to exceed \$500 for periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; not to exceed \$500 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Commissioner, at meetings concerned with the work of the Administration; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and all other necessary administrative expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United Housing Authority", on page 49, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$4,550,000" and insert "\$4,510,000"; on page 50, line 17, after the word "by" to strike out "the Informational Service Division of the Authority, or any other division or subdivision thereof, in connection with the collection, preparation, or dissemination of information concerning the activities of the Authority" and insert "the Authority in connection with its informational service functions, including press and related activities, photographic displays, exhibits, and other educational or descriptive pamphlets or materials, printing, binding, and reproduction

of materials involving informational service functions"; and on page 51, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$152,000" and insert "\$50,000", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: Not to exceed \$4,510,000 of the funds of the United States Housing Authority, established by the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C., Supp. IV, 1401), shall be available for all necessary administrative expenses of the Authority in carrying out the provisions of said act, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; reproducing, photographing, and labor-saving devices and office appliances; not to exceed \$5,000 for the purchase and exchange of lawbooks and other books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; not to exceed \$4,000 for purchase of seven motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes; not to exceed \$2,500 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Administrator, at meetings or conventions concerned with the work of the Authority; not to exceed \$15,000 for the preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; not to exceed \$25,000 for employing persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, for special reporting, engineering, technical, legal, and other services determined necessary by the Administrator, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this paragraph, the amount used by the Authority in connection with its informational service functions, including press and related activities, photographic displays, exhibits, and other educational or descriptive pamphlets or materials, printing, binding, and reproduction of materials involving informational service functions, shall not exceed \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 18, after the word "is", to strike out "occupied by" and insert "rented with the knowledge and consent of such public-housing agency to", so as to read:

Annual contributions: For the payment of annual contributions to public-housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C., Supp. IV, 1410), \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That, except for payments required on contracts entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act, no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment to any public-housing agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent housing project, any portion of which is rented with the knowledge and consent of such public-housing agency to any person other than a citizen of the United States.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this amendment was inserted after a question was raised as to the House language. The matter has been called to the attention of one or two Members of the Senate. I understood the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] was going to present the matter, but he is not present. The members of the Housing Authority say that the language the committee put in would not accomplish that which the committee had in mind. The original language provided that no payments could be made to a public-housing agency if any of the property was occupied by an alien. The committee felt that that would impose a burden which it would be practically impossible to discharge. For instance, there might be on the property an alien servant or a brother or a cousin who was an alien. The committee changed the provision so as to make it applicable when the property was rented to an alien. Now the Housing Authority says if we leave it in that form it will still involve a great degree of policing to ascertain the facts. They suggest an amendment which I am about to offer and which I think is a proper one. In order that the amendment may be in proper form, I first ask that the committee amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 51, line 18.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ADAMS. I now offer the amendment to which I have referred.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the words "any portion of which is occupied by" and insert in lieu thereof "unless the public housing agency shall have adopted regulations forbidding admission to the project as a tenant of."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading United States Maritime Commission, on page 71, line 15, after the numerals "1936", to strike out "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$164,000,000", and in line 18, after the word "including", to strike out the comma and "but not limited to," so as to read:

To increase the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, \$164,000,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the United States Maritime Commission, including the following: Personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, including not to exceed \$2,000 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the chairman of the Commission, at meetings concerned with work of the Commission; printing and binding; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed \$4,000 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services, including telephone, telegraph, radio, and teletype services; purchase and exchange (not to exceed \$3,000), maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles for official use; typewriting and adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; rent, including heat, light, and power, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; expenses (not exceeding \$15,000) of packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household effects and other personal property (not exceeding 5,000 pounds in any one case) of employees when transferred from one official station to another for permanent duty, upon specific authorization by the chairman of the Commission; expenses incurred in preparing and transporting, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant, the remains of employees who may die while in the discharge of their official duties abroad or in transit thereto or therefrom, and for the ordinary expenses of interment of such remains; necessary expenses (not exceeding \$5,000) incident to the education and training of personnel of the Commission detailed at institutions for scientific education and research as authorized by the act of August 4, 1939; compensation as authorized by said act of August 4, 1939, for officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, detailed to the Commission; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act of June 26, 1930; and including not to exceed \$75,000 for the employment, on a contract or fee basis, of persons, firms, or corporations for the performance of special services, including accounting, legal, actuarial, and statistical services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration", on page 73, line 21, after the word "administering", to strike out "\$101,403,240" and insert "\$101,228,240", so as to read:

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For all salaries and expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including the expenses of maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services of the Veterans' Administration, in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans," approved July 3, 1930 (38 U. S. C. 11-11f), and any and all laws for which the Veterans' Administration is now or may hereafter be charged with administering, \$101,228,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 7, to reduce the total for the Veterans' Administration from "\$580,180,544" to "\$580,005,544."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 8, after the word "That", to strike out "no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes except for cooking purposes: *Provided further*, That", so as to read:

Total, Veterans' Administration, \$580,005,544: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation can be used for hospitalization or examination of persons other than veterans unless a reciprocal schedule of pay is in effect with the Agency or Department involved.

Mr. McNARY, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to call the particular attention of the Senate to the words proposed to be stricken from the bill on page 78, and to what I believe would

be the result if such action should be taken. The words proposed to be stricken out are:

No part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes except for cooking purposes.

To eliminate those words from the bill would strike directly at the dairy producers and also at the ex-service men who are confined in Veterans' Bureau hospitals. The adoption of the amendment would cut down the market for the butter produced by the dairyman; it would take away from the sick ex-service man in the veterans' hospitals real, pure butter, and would make it possible for the veterans' hospitals to give the service men oleomargarine instead of butter. Therefore, I trust that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I think little need be added to the explanation which has just been offered by my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. I merely wish to state that I wholeheartedly support his position, and favor the restoration of the language proposed to be stricken out, which, as I understand, for many years has been in bills of this character.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in explanation of the action of the committee, I think it should be said that there is nothing in this bill requiring the Veterans' Administration to purchase only oleomargarine. In many instances physicians have prescribed oleomargarine for their patients and advised them to avoid the use of butter. I know of Members of this body who have been so advised by the physician at the Capitol who attends Members of this body.

The elimination of this language would simply make it possible to purchase oleomargarine in any case in which the officials of a hospital, or the doctors in charge, thought it wise that oleomargarine be used. Nowhere is there any justification for writing into the laws of the country a provision that a certain product shall not be used in a hospital or any other place under the jurisdiction of the Government.

That was the reason why the committee acted as it did.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this type of restriction or limitation on an appropriation was first embodied in the law as a result of the efforts made by my former colleague, the late Senator John J. Blaine. The question arose again in 1938, when an effort was made on the floor of the Senate to strike a provision of this kind from one of the appropriation bills. At that time the same contention made by the Senator from South Carolina was advanced in support of the amendment to strike the provision from the bill. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will indulge me for a few moments while I refer to the original statistics upon which the amendment offered by my late colleague was based.

It has been contended again and again by those who have sought to eliminate such a provision as this that there was no contemplation that any large amount of oleomargarine would be purchased in case the provision was eliminated. Therefore, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it was the large utilization of oleomargarine in veterans' hospitals and other public institutions which in the past led to the incorporation of this language in appropriation bills.

In the 11 national homes for disabled volunteer soldiers there were used in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, 91,356 pounds of butter and 502,407 pounds of oleomargarine or butterine.

In the 5 United States prisons, for the same fiscal year, there were used 20,139 pounds of butter, and 196,627 pounds of oleomargarine or butterine.

In the 51 veterans' hospitals to which this particular amendment relates under United States Veterans' Bureau supervision there were used 979,918 pounds of butter and 157,073 pounds of oleomargarine for cooking purposes only.

In two of the five United States hospitals for soldiers at present in service there were used 214,780 pounds of butter, and 11,872 pounds of oleomargarine or butterine.

In the Marine hospitals under the Public Health Service there were used in that fiscal year 187,759 pounds of butter, and 8,804 pounds of oleomargarine.

In the United States naval hospitals, 15 in number, there were used 250,875 pounds of butter, and no butterine or oleomargarine.

It will be observed from these figures that prior to the enactment of legislation of this character, oleomargarine was used in varying degrees, but in many of the public institutions under the supervision of the United States there was a considerable utilization of oleomargarine in the diet of the persons in those institutions. As I see the matter in the light of this past experience, we may very well assume that if this restriction is withdrawn, and the supervisory officials of these various institutions have the opportunity to work out their dietary allowances in amounts of money, we shall again find oleomargarine playing an important part in the diet of those who are dependent upon these institutions for their subsistence.

Mr. President, I do not believe that at this late date the Senate of the United States wants to go on record as withdrawing this protection to the veterans, and thus permitting the veterans' hospitals to utilize oleomargarine within their discretion in the diet of patients in the veterans' hospitals. I do not believe we have reached such a pass that it is necessary for the Government of the United States to stint the diet of the veterans.

This provision is contained in numerous appropriation bills. There has been a constant effort to bring about its repeal; but I contend that, in the light of the facts which existed prior to the time Congress established this precedent, we should continue it, and that we should provide that the appropriation should not be utilized for the purpose of purchasing oleomargarine to be included in the diet of those under the care of the United States Government in various hospitals and other institutions.

It has been contended, as the Senator from South Carolina suggested, that doctors have prescribed oleomargarine or other butter substitutes in the diet of those who are not able to utilize butterfat; but, Mr. President, in the light of past experience, I think it is amply evident that unless the Congress retains this policy we shall find that there will be further utilization of butter substitutes, not as a means of taking care of the rare cases in which individuals because of their physical condition cannot utilize butter, but a condition will be reestablished such as prevailed before these restrictions were written into appropriation bills. Furthermore, we may rest assured that if this particular amendment is agreed to, similar efforts will be made to eliminate this safeguarding provision from other appropriation bills as they come along in the course of the present session of Congress.

Therefore, I share the hope expressed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] that this amendment of the committee will be rejected.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to say only one word in response to what the Senator from Wisconsin has stated.

First, I am very happy to say that the motion in the committee to strike out this language was made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], not by the Senator from South Carolina; but I think the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin shows the wisdom of the action.

According to the Senator from Wisconsin, prior to the time this language was placed in a bill, a considerable quantity of oleomargarine had been used in the hospitals of the country. It is true, of course, that the greater part of it was used for cooking purposes. Therefore, it appears from his statement that those in charge of the hospitals did not deem it unwise to use oleomargarine. If it had been impure, it could not have been sold; the Government itself would have prevented it. When it is pure, and it is sold and can be bought by any citizen, the law is resorted to, not to protect patients in a hospital, but to protect the producers of one commodity against the producers of another commodity.

If my recollection is correct, the State of Wisconsin places a tax upon the sale of oleomargarine. Recently I noticed in the press the statement that the Governor of Wisconsin said he was going to urge upon the legislature of that State

that the tax be repealed. I was glad to see the statement, because if one State in the Union adopts the policy of taxing the commodities produced in another State, or if Members of the Congress resort to asking that a law be enacted to protect the producers of one commodity against the producers of another, the inevitable result will be a war between the States among producers of different commodities.

I think that would be unfortunate. It is surprising to me that this provision has not inspired retaliation, that it has not resulted in some of the States saying, "If that is going to be done, then we will enact laws prohibiting the sale of certain commodities in this State."

I think we could well leave to the discretion of the officials in the various institutions of government the determination whether they would use one product or another so long as it is a product whose sale is not prohibited under the pure food law.

I really believe that it is a step in the right direction to remove embargoes against American products.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, every Senator knows the reason behind this effort to exclude from use the particular product now under consideration. Several years ago I was a member of a committee appointed to investigate the cost of living and the question arose as to the use of oleomargarine in place of butter. Dr. Wiley, who was then the head of the Pure Food and Drugs Division of the Department of Agriculture, was a witness, and specific and categorical questions were put to him as to the purity, wholesomeness, and digestibility of oleomargarine as compared with butter. He replied categorically. He said oleomargarine was just as pure, just as nutritious, just as wholesome as butter; and he added one other expression which to me was new. He said, "and when colored with the pure extract of carrot, it is just as pleasing to the eye."

Mr. President, this is a matter which has been before the Congress at various times. I deplore the recent decision of the Supreme Court upholding the power of a State to lay a tax upon the product of another State when the product or commodity is used within the State laying the tax. It seems to me that if one article is just as pure, nutritious, and wholesome as another, and is by some preferred to the other article we should not use the powerful arm of the Federal Government to discredit that article in order to protect a group of States, or one State, from competition. I do not know where this decision of the Supreme Court will land us. Our high-protective tariff is alleged to afford wonderful benefit to a certain group, and it is natural for those who can utilize it to apply it locally. I think the committee was very wise in leaving it to the discretion of those who have charge of public hospitals and other institutions, allowing them to be governed by the conditions they find.

It seems to me that we are embarking on the most dangerous principle that can characterize a free people if we pass this measure and deny protection to a far-flung industry, which, as my colleague has said, is protected under the Pure Food and Drug Act, and say, for the sake of destroying competition, "You cannot come in. No matter how pure, no matter how wholesome, no matter how the other article may be designed, we are not going to allow you to compete with us in our markets."

I think every honest-minded man here sees that that is a dangerous precedent. If there were in oleomargarine anything deleterious, if there were in it anything which might impair the health of or discriminate against anyone in those institutions over which we have powerful control, its use ought to be prohibited; it ought to be outlawed.

I have from time to time tried to call attention to the unfairness of this action. It is not a local matter entirely, because in my State, under the wise provision of our present administration, we have been persuaded and paid to stop producing certain crops. You tried to keep us from going into the cattle business, but I invite you to come to our section and see what we are doing. Up in your God-forsaken part of the country you have to protect your cows and feed them for about 6 months in the year. I can graze mine for 12 months on growing vegetation, except now and

then in an exceptionally cold spell, and in all the coastal plain I can sink an artesian well 190 or 200 feet and have the purest water in the world flowing forever. My cows do not have to be stall fed. If you want to invite competition, we are willing to enter into competition, but you have not law enough or men enough, nor have you the right, to prohibit me from making my living as I see fit to make it. The South, in the raising of cattle, surpasses other sections, and has done so for 75 or 76 years, and by virtue of being a great territory, is today the unexploited section of America.

Keep on with this kind of thing, and you will find after a while that the butter will be made in the South, the hogs will be raised in the South, the sheep will be grown in the South, and you will have to pass legislation if you live at all. I am warning you now.

Why do I say this condition exists? The possibilities in the South are untouched. We have about 75 or 80 percent of all the standing timber in America today. Heretofore the rosin and turpentine incident to our pines have made it impossible to convert them into paper, but now the chemists have discovered a process by which they can extract the valuable turpentine and rosin and make the finest paper in the world out of the pulp when these elements are extracted.

We have in the South a kindly climate and a fertile soil. But we did not have any capital. We had to pay to the protected industries all we could make. Now we are getting them down there and I expect we will be protectionists after a while.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of what section is the Senator speaking?

Mr. SMITH. I am speaking of all that section south of the Mason and Dixon's line, and not of the section up in the frozen, God-forsaken part of the country above us, where there is from 6 to 8 months of ungodly cold weather, where people shiver and have to take from us in order to live at all. If it had not been for the protective tariff that would have been, if not a wilderness, at least a semiwilderness, and a semidesert.

The State of Oregon has some very splendid advantages. After a while the farmers there will get the things that will protect their fruit from pests. But by and large it does not behoove us to try to discriminate by a Federal law against a legitimate business of one State as against another. I hope the committee's very timid and very hesitating "We will not say you shall not do it, but we will just say we will leave it to the other fellow," will not prevail.

Mr. President, we are all American citizens, but if we do not watch our step we will be Americans only in name. The change is right on us. The form of our Government, which we have all loved and lived for all these years, is being undermined and taken away. It is said the Constitution is obsolete. The bill of inalienable rights is discarded under the general-welfare clause. God help us!

Mr. President, I would rather suffer personally, in person and property, to save the institutions which have made us what we are, and are capable of making us still greater, if we have the courage, the manhood, and the patriotism to rebuke any man or set of men who, under the compelling condition of a terrible depression, asks us to give up our splendid system of government in order that those whom God did not endow with the capacity of getting rich should be made comfortable at the expense of those who had the capacity to accumulate something for the future.

In conclusion let me say that the backwash of the Revolutionary War and the incidents antedating it, made men who were tried in the crucible of suffering. Those who won their rights had a true appreciation of them. When attempt was made to take those rights from them the Boston Tea Party resulted. Then came the magnificent Declaration of Independence. Then came the victory. Then came the Constitution of the United States, which will never be obsolete so long as real men love liberty. The original articles and the 10 amendments which compose the Bill of Rights of the individual, are as eternal as human nature.

It has been the experience of humanity through the years that those who have power usually want to impose their will on a free, liberty-loving people as well as upon peoples who are neither free nor liberty loving.

Mr. President, we have allowed certain elements to come into our country, and we have justified what we have done on the ground that we are relieving suffering, and relieving this, and relieving that.

The bill under consideration provides for only part of the Government, but, God help us, the aggregate amount proposed to be appropriated in the measure is in excess of what it cost to run the entire Government 40 years ago.

Of course it will cost us untold millions if we propose to run every State in the Union, and set up independent States within the States. As for me, I am not going to vote for such proposals. I have not long to live, but I have a duty to perform to my country, to uphold and carry on what was guaranteed to us by the real p-a-t-r-i-o-t-s. We once had a majority of them. Now we have 130,000,000 people, but many of them are p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, let us have a vote!

Mr. SMITH. Oh, yes; but the Senator does not hear such statements very often, and he ought to sit down and listen to this statement.

Mr. President, I am opposed to this kind of legislation. However, the Senator from Virginia, who ought to be my friend, is getting restive under what I have to say. I do not talk much, but when I do I hope I talk to a purpose. I have said at least in part what I intended to say before this session of Congress shall adjourn. I shall later call the attention of the Senate to how far we have gone along the road toward Hitlerism, Stalinism, and communism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 78, line 8.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Austin	Gerry	McCarran	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Smathers
Barkley	Glass	McNary	Smith
Brown	Green	Maloney	Stewart
Bulow	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Hale	Minton	Tydings
Byrnes	Harrison	Murray	Vandenberg
Capper	Hill	Norris	Wagner
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Davis	La Follette	Reed	White
Donahay	Lee	Reynolds	
Ellender	Lodge	Russell	
Frazier	Lucas	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I again announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 78, line 8. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. I wish to be sure of the parliamentary situation. As I understand, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has moved to disagree to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BURKE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who is detained from the Senate by illness. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. He is not present, and I do not know how he would vote. I, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. MEAD (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who, if he were present, would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. My colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS. I have just heard the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] transfer his pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. I am instructed to say that if my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland, were present and voting on this question he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is necessarily absent. He has a pair. If present, he would vote "nay."

I make the same announcement in behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, she would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Dowell, of Iowa. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained from the Senate in an important committee meeting. He is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business. These Senators are paired on this amendment. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senators from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST and Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained in committee meetings.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—11			
Byrnes	Green	Miller	Sheppard
Ellender	Harrison	Reynolds	Smith
George	Hill	Russell	
NAYS—42			
Adams	Frazier	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Austin	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gurney	Mead	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Minton	Vandenberg
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Wagner
Capper	La Follette	Norris	Walsh
Danaher	Lee	O'Mahoney	White
Davis	Lodge	Reed	
Donahay	Lucas	Schwartz	
NOT VOTING—43			
Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Slattery
Ashurst	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bailey	Connally	King	Taft
Bankhead	Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Gillette	Neely	Tobey
Bone	Glass	Nye	Townsend
Bridges	Hatch	Overton	Truman
Burke	Hayden	Pepper	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	Pittman	Wheeler
Chandler	Holman	Radcliffe	Wiley
Chavez	Holt	Shipstead	

So the committee amendment was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot finish the consideration of the bill this afternoon, as much as we had hoped to do so. Therefore, I think we might suspend at this time.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations and treaties, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably the nomination of Paul Edwards, of New York, to be Work Projects Administrator for the District of Columbia.

He also, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

He also, from the same committee, reported adversely the nomination of Kathleen McT. Gregg to be postmaster at Greensburg, Pa., in place of J. T. Painter, retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Melvin C. Hazen to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate to make a statement with reference to the confirmation of this nomination.

When the Executive Calendar was called last week I asked that action be delayed upon this nomination for the reason that I desired to make an inquiry of the Commissioner. Last November an officer on the police force, Sergeant Brodie, came to see me. I had not previously known the gentleman. He stated that after 16 years' service as a detective sergeant he was to be demoted; that he did not know the reason why, and asked if it could be ascertained by me. I wrote a letter inquiring, expecting to be advised of the reasons for the demotion and thinking that would end my connection with the matter.

To my surprise I received a letter stating simply that a detective sergeant was not treated as a uniformed sergeant, that he was not entitled to a trial, and the Commissioners, and the superintendent of police were not required to give to him any information as to the cause of his demotion; that the reasons for the demotion the Commissioner would tell me privately when he saw me.

I advised the Commissioner that I wanted no private information about the matter; that I assumed it was a public record; and that the people of the District should be entitled to have it; and that certainly any Member of the Senate should be entitled to information as to a public record unless it was of such character that it could be shown that its disclosure would not be for the good of the service.

I wrote two or three letters with the same result. In each letter I was told that when I returned to Washington the Commissioner would talk to me in my office about the matter. I did not want to talk to the Commissioner privately about it. I insisted that he answer me so that I could advise the officer. When I asked last week that the confirmation be delayed, I again wrote asking for the information.

The following morning the chairman of the District Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], invited me to his office, where the Commissioner and the superintendent of police were. The Commissioner then advised me that he really had not written the letters; that they had been written by one of the attorneys connected with the District government; and he agreed that he should have given to me the information.

I make this statement because ordinarily there is a disposition on the part of those connected with the District government, whenever a Member of the Senate or House makes an inquiry, to attribute to the Senator or Representative an interest in securing an appointment or in securing promotion for some individual employee of the Government. It so happens that in 14 years in the House and in my service here in the Senate I have never spoken to any District Commissioner about any policeman. I have never sought to secure the appointment of a policeman or the promotion for any man on the force. I believed, however, first, that a Member of the Senate ought to be able to secure information as to a public record, and, second, if that record showed that an officer was guilty of misconduct, that he should be dismissed from the force, and if it showed that he had violated any criminal law the officer should be prosecuted just like any other criminal. That was all the officer asked, and it was so reasonable a request that I made it in his behalf.

The Commissioner advised me that he would have a board try this officer; and I have no reason for asking further delay in action upon this nomination. I am satisfied that Mr. Hazen did not personally write me the letters I received. I regret that he signed them, because I do not think it is in the interest of the service in the District of Columbia for the Commission to take such a position. Furthermore, the officers of the police force, whether they be detective sergeants or uniformed sergeants, if they are charged with any misconduct, should be advised as to that alleged misconduct, and should be given an opportunity to answer. If it is a question of efficiency, it is all right to demote a man; but if it is a question of misconduct or violation of a law, every American citizen should have the right to know what he is charged with and have an opportunity to answer the charge.

If the policy followed in this case were generally followed, men who had served, as this man had, for 22 years and for 16 years as a detective sergeant, would never know at what moment they would be demoted to the ranks without any information as to the reason for such demotion. That would destroy the morale of the service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator should add, and will be glad to add when I invite his attention to the matter, that under the rules or under the law the defendant in this case—if we may call him a defendant—is entitled to a trial by a

board not connected with the Police Department, a board of citizens of repute who will be named by the Commissioners; and that will be done.

Mr. BYRNES. The chairman of the committee [Senator KING] suggested that such a board be provided for the trial of this officer. That is all the officer asked. I have no interest in the man holding his job if he has violated any law. I became interested when I learned, to my surprise, that it was possible for a man to be demoted for misconduct and not be advised of the misconduct of which he was supposed to be guilty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Melvin C. Hazen to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John C. Mahoney to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, last week the nomination of a successor to Judge Mahoney as judge of the District Court for the District of Rhode Island was confirmed by the Senate; but at the time there was no vacancy, and there will be none until Judge Mahoney's nomination as judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals is confirmed. I therefore ask that notification of the confirmation of his nomination be immediately sent to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Cox to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William F. Burguson to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Reed Sharp to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George A. Malcolm to be Attorney General of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard will be confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1940

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

George H. Earle, III, of Pennsylvania, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

David Gray, of Florida, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iran, to be also Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1940

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Melvin C. Hazen to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

John C. Mahoney to be a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the first circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Charles H. Cox to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

William F. Burguson to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina.

Reed Sharp to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

George A. Malcolm to be the attorney general of Puerto Rico.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Irving Leo Gill to be commander.
 Frederick Albert Edgecomb to be commander.
 William Wellesley Demeritt to be commander.
 Forrest Irvin Phippeny to be lieutenant.
 Silas Franklin Clark to be lieutenant.
 Neil William Wetherby to be lieutenant.
 Wayne Leroy Goff to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Ronald Melville Freeman to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Harold Douglas Seielstad to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Thomas Bates McKinstry to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 William F. Towle to be captain.
 Harvey F. Johnson to be engineer in chief, with the rank of rear admiral.

Robert J. Lafferty to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Chester H. Jones to be captain.
 Albert A. Lawrence to be professor, with the rank of lieutenant.

Robert E. Reed-Hill to be ensign (temporary).
 John Rogers Shuman to be ensign (temporary).
 Noble G. Ricketts to be commander.
 Harold G. Bradbury to be commander.
 Rae B. Hall to be commander.
 Charles Abraham Park to be captain.

Ralph Russell Tinkham to be captain.
 Frank William Ockenfels to be lieutenant commander.
 Carl Field Ganong to be lieutenant commander.
 Lawrence Merle Harding to be lieutenant commander.
 Morris Gibson Jory to be lieutenant commander.
 Anthony Michael Zibilich to be lieutenant commander.
 Dwight Atwater Chase to be lieutenant commander.
 Frank Ray Bellomy to be lieutenant commander.
 Thomas Gorman Byrne to be ensign.
 Leslie Glenn Haverland to be ensign.
 Roscoe House to be commander.
 Frederick Paul Dillon to be commander.
 Edward Cressey Merrill to be commander.
 Norman Cyril Manyon to be commander.
 Guy Burdette Skinner to be commander.
 Frederick Charles Hingsburg to be commander.
 William Henry Barton to be commander.
 Gideon Wesley Hitchens to be commander.
 Ray Lyton Hankinson to be commander.
 Henry Edward Litchfield to be lieutenant.
 William Gordon Wallace to be lieutenant.
 Thomas Sampson to be lieutenant.
 Henry Benners Haskins to be lieutenant.
 Harry Stephen Salzer to be lieutenant.
 Verne Cyril Gibson to be lieutenant.
 Roswell Gallup Lamb to be lieutenant.
 George Casper Balzer to be lieutenant.
 Charles da Rocha Monteiro to be lieutenant.
 Hugh Donald Wear to be lieutenant.
 Daniel Joseph Lucinski to be lieutenant.
 George Arthur Piper to be lieutenant.
 Harold Libby Durgin to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Joseph Raymond Davis to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Ellis Samuel Gordon to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Myron Wendall Caskey to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Forrest Arnold Tinsler to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Julian Simeon Loewus to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Joseph Anthony Ciccolella to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Ralph Sylvester Feola to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Howard William Schleiter to be lieutenant (junior grade).
 Richard Heymes Fairman to be lieutenant (junior grade).

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

George C. Wentworth, Wickenburg.

GEORGIA

Walter R. Cannon, Clayton.
 Paul L. Watson, Ellijay.
 Fletcher N. Carlisle, Flowery Branch.

ILLINOIS

Daniel P. Bergin, Chicago Heights.
 Joseph W. Hrubby, Lyons.
 Clement Jordan, Paxton.
 John D. Lannon, Saunemin.

KANSAS

Orville Mills, Medicine Lodge.

KENTUCKY

Millissa Gertrude Owens, Brodhead.

MISSOURI

John E. Craig, Mansfield.
 Leta D. Smith, Pineville.
 Abe Paul, South West City.

NEVADA

Virgil D. Hall, Kimberly.
 Gladys K. Mohnike, Silverpeak.

NEW JERSEY

Robert A. Stretch, Somers Point.

NEW YORK

Leonard W. Cramer, Cherry Valley.
 Edgar M. Mapes, Patchogue.
 Frederick L. Ritchie, Philmont.
 William J. Murray, Rockville Centre.
 James C. McDonald, Schenectady.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coit M. Graves, Pageland.

TEXAS

Robert C. Dooley, Justin.

VERMONT

Thomas J. Fitzgerald, Bellows Falls.
 Michael C. Mulcahy, Brandon.
 Foster C. Parmenter, Chester.
 Jeremiah C. Durick, Fair Haven.
 Oscar N. Campbell, Hyde Park.
 John J. Rock, Ludlow.
 Carroll E. Jenkins, Orleans.
 Martha G. Kibby, Randolph Center.
 Daniel F. Aher, Springfield.
 Irene F. Smith, Waitsfield.
 Clinton M. Hall, Wilmington.

VIRGINIA

Isaac C. Taylor, Big Stone Gap.
 Florence T. Beans, Round Hill.

WASHINGTON

Marie L. Wenberg, East Stanwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAYBURN].

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the way, the truth, and the life, we laud and magnify Thy glorious name. O Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; in Thee power, love, and compassion are eternal and everlasting. Let Thy holy hand be laid upon us; blend the discords of our natures into heaven's harmony and soften the tears of repentance into psalms of victory. O Thou Christ, do Thou still call across the centuries to heartsore humanity; Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Oh, come and let hunger-bitten lips be fed, chilled bodies be clothed; come, and may the stranger be received, the sick visited, and thus weave for our immortal souls robes of righteousness that our blessed Lord and His saints will approve. In the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1157. An act for the relief of Roy D. Cook, a minor.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7805) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments, Coast Guard, and Federal Bureau of Investigation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 5 to the bill (H. R. 8067) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 228

FEBRUARY 6, 1940.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CASSIUS C. DOWELL, late a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

Pursuant to the foregoing the Vice President appointed Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING as members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGHTON assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our able and beloved Speaker is unable to be present, as he is suffering from a slight case of influenza. He is confined to his bed and the House physician forbids his coming to the sessions of the House. I am happy to say that he is improving and the doctor is confident he will be able to return to his duties within a few days.

The Speaker could designate a Speaker pro tempore, but if he did so, some question could arise as to the authority of the Speaker pro tempore to appoint conference committees and sign enrolled bills. There will be ready for signature several enrolled bills today and tomorrow, and it is necessary that they be promptly signed so that they may be transmitted to the President.

In order that this may be accomplished, I shall offer a privileged resolution, and in connection with this I may say that the procedure has the concurrence of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 377

Resolved, That Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. SAM RAYBURN as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RAYBURN resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore and the oath of office was administered by Mr. McCORMACK.

DOMICILE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' BUREAU

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. COCHRAN was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter from General Hines and brief quotations from the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill.)

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Members are continually calling the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments requesting information concerning bills which have been introduced which have for their purpose eliminating the Veterans' Bureau regulations whereby employees are required to be domiciled at the facility where they are employed, or, stating it more plainly, the charges for quarters, subsistence, and laundry, regardless as to whether or not the employee accepts the service.

It has been pointed out, and very properly so, that this works a severe hardship on the personnel, especially those who are married and whose families live close to the facility.

When the independent offices appropriation bill was under consideration by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, the Administrator, was questioned at length on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks that part of the hearings which I refer to:

ADJUSTMENT IN CHARGES FOR QUARTERS, SUBSISTENCE, AND LAUNDRY FOR ORDERLIES AND ATTENDANTS

Mr. WOODRUM. You will recall in the hearings last year that the question of adjustments in the charges for quarters, subsistence, and laundry for field employees was discussed. Have you been able to work out any satisfactory plan for relieving employees from these charges, as I notice that you have not requested any funds for this specific purpose in your 1941 budget.

General HINES. We had up with the Budget the proposition of Q. S. and L. We did not include it in our estimates. We submitted a statement on that subject alone, and with the committee's permission I would like to make some reference to that statement in order that the data may be correct.

First—before I take this up—I had a feeling that when the 8-hour day was put into effect, we would be in a better position definitely to determine the personnel that had to be at the station at the time meals were served.

In other words, the hours run generally from 7 to 3; from 3 for the next 8 hours; and then the midnight shift. During that period those that are serving when one meal is served, in my judgment, should pay for only one meal. Those are serving hours when two meals are served, necessarily cannot leave their duty to go and get meals. Their work is right there. The mealtime is limited. Those that are living off the station certainly could not go and get back within a half hour allowed for the noonday meal.

I thoroughly believe in the fairness of only charging them for the meals served during the period they are there; they can take them and eventually we will have to adjust this matter before complaints subside in that respect.

I think the Budget, after we had presented this statement, felt that I should endeavor within the funds allowed to see how far I could go, because they did not include any new money for that.

Mr. WOODRUM. We gave you \$2,000,000 a year or two ago for that specific purpose, did we not?

General HINES. Yes. In the appropriation for the fiscal year 1937 we were allowed \$2,000,000 which permitted us to partially place this program into effect by allowing certain deserving married employees or those with dependents who were then required to take quarters, subsistence, and laundry to be relieved from these charges and live off the stations.

Mr. WOODRUM. There has been such persistent complaint about that that I think it ought to be done. I do not think you can justify, nor can the Government justify, taking a man who lives at home, who does not have to take his meals out, or lives on the station, and take out of his wages money for those meals. In some cases it reduces the wages to less than \$70 a month, on which a man with a family would find it difficult to live. I do not think we can stand up and defend that. I do not think I can do it any longer.

Mr. CASE. I think the chairman is absolutely right about that.

General HINES. Let me present to you what I presented to the Budget.

"In connection with our budget estimate for salaries during the fiscal year 1941, I desire at this point to discuss a problem with which this Administration is presently faced, namely, the deductions now made from the salaries of certain employees for allowances furnished, particularly that for subsistence. Under our present policy incumbents of certain types of positions are considered foodhandlers and their appointment on a salary plus subsistence basis is mandatory. Included in this group are nurses, dietitians, cooks, mess and hospital attendants.

"We have had numerous appeals during the past few years from certain of these employees living off the hospital reservations, from whose salary full subsistence is deducted notwithstanding the fact that they do not partake of three meals per day, as they are off duty during one or more meal periods daily."

Mr. CASE. At that point, has not subsistence also been charged against them during the time that they have been on leave or on vacation?

General HINES. We have taken that into account by figuring that into the total number of days and arriving at the rate charged. It looks as though they are charged for that, but that is taken into account in fixing the rate.

Mr. CASE. I recognize that that is true, but they do not understand that.

General HINES. I know that.

Mr. CASE. I have been hounded by friends of employees who say, "How can you possibly justify charging them for subsistence during the 2 weeks or the month that they may be on leave?"

General HINES. That is true, but at the same time they went into that and took it into account. But I fully agree with you that it is a difficult position to defend because it does appear that they are being charged. In reality the rate was fixed with that in view. To continue my quotation:

"The inauguration of the 8-hour day has further increased the number of employees so affected. Recently this problem has become more aggravated and there has been rather widespread agitation for an adjustment of our policy and I have been advised, by sources believed to be reliable, that the Appropriations Subcommittee will give serious consideration toward providing additional funds for this purpose unless the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget take appropriate action. I would much prefer that this be worked out as an administrative measure rather than as the result of congressional legislation which, I believe, would be too broad in its application."

I think there is that danger on the floor. I am not talking now about the committee, but I believe that if an attempt were made to put an amendment in, it would go through.

"It is estimated that there would be approximately 8,451 employees affected by this adjustment in the 1941 fiscal year. Based on a minimum average of \$270 per annum for subsistence, this would require an additional \$2,281,770. It is proposed, however, to make mandatory the acceptance of such meals as are served during the work period of the group of employees involved for which payment will be made, for individual meals served. To compute the

approximate amount which would be obtained in this manner, it is estimated that this number of employees would average one meal per day at the rate of \$90 per annum for 11 months each year, which allows for annual leave, and totals approximately \$697,000. It is anticipated that the number of employees who would partake of two meals per day would be offset by those on sick leave or off duty on Sundays and holidays. This last-named amount, representing refunds, must under present law be deposited into 'Miscellaneous receipts, Treasury Department,' which would not aid our appropriation.

"Through the adoption of the above procedure there is another potential saving which would assist in reducing the estimated cost of \$2,281,770. The reduction in the number of meals or rations served to these employees should result in some saving in the cost of raw food purchased. I am somewhat dubious as to whether this cost would be reduced in direct proportion to the reduction in the number of meals served this group of employees, but I am, however, estimating a saving of \$700,000 on this basis.

"In view of the above calculations, it appears that this adjustment in the deductions now made from the salaries of employees for subsistence who are not residing on the respective field station would require \$1,500,000 in addition to the amount requested for salaries in the 1941 Budget estimate."

Mr. WOODRUM. On that basis, that would not go into operation until July, would it?

General HINES. That is right, unless you made it immediately available.

Mr. WOODRUM. How much money would you have to have to put that into effect January 1?

General HINES. We feel the amount we suggested to the Budget, \$1,500,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. What about the rest of this year?

General HINES. That is a full year. The rest of this year would be half of that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Seven or eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. WOODRUM. General, I think I am speaking the unanimous opinion of this committee when I say that I would like to see that done. I think I can say that if it means a deficit, this committee would back you up. If there is any gentleman of the committee that does not agree with that statement, I would like to have him express himself.

General HINES. I am willing to undertake it, and with that understanding we would not have to have this appropriation immediately.

Mr. WOODRUM. Would you need any language in the legislation?

General HINES. No.

Mr. WOODRUM. You can handle it administratively?

General HINES. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. We have the understanding, then, that in the next fiscal year you will put in this plan that you speak of, and the committee will take care of a deficit if it is made necessary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There will still be \$90 a year taken out of that, will there not?

General HINES. I cannot see how we can escape that. I cannot understand how a man would leave and go home to get a noonday meal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What would that average per meal, approximately?

General HINES. About 26 cents.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is quite reasonable.

Mr. STARNES. It would seem he would be foolish to go home, at that.

General HINES. If the Government makes any money on meals it would be the first time it has done it.

I will start putting this into effect this fiscal year, provided I can find the money with which to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say I have discussed this question with General Hines on numerous occasions, as I am heartily in sympathy with the effort being made to correct this situation which cannot be defended. This morning I received a letter from General Hines on the subject, which I will insert in the RECORD. The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 6, 1940.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Reference is made to our recent conference, when we discussed the question of quarters, subsistence, and laundry for employees engaged at our various field facilities.

The optional feature of allowances has been given a great deal of study by the Veterans' Administration in connection with its efforts to institute policies and promulgate instructions which have for their purpose the improvement of employment conditions. Our objective is to provide that allowances be optional to the extent that the needs of the service permit. On the other hand, the question of acceptance of quarters by employees is not peculiar to facilities of the Veterans' Administration. The nature of our operations has caused provision to be made for quartering employees on the station and also for providing for other allowances, subsistence, and laundry. These requirements are understood by employees at the time of employment; notwithstanding, relief is afforded whenever possible. The maximum that may be accomplished, however, must accord with the requirements of the service and with available funds.

A policy placed into effect June 1, 1939, provided for relief from quarters charges in the cases of those employees assigned to non-

housekeeping quarters, who maintain homes in the vicinity of the station for persons wholly dependent upon them for support. For those in certain positions, however, 40 percent are required to have quarters assigned. According to the policy previously in effect, 50 percent of the employees had been subject to this requirement. Those classified as food handlers, however, have not to date been relieved of the charge for subsistence. At this time consideration is being given to making adjustments in charges for subsistence; that is, study is being made at representative stations to determine the extent of adjustments necessary in applying a policy of charging for subsistence to those living off the station only on the basis of meals served during their tour of duty.

In this connection I desire to invite your attention to the statement I made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives at the time hearings were being held on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1941, when this subject was discussed in some detail (pp. 611, 612, 613, and 614). I stated, among other things, that our tentative plan involved an amount approximating \$1,500,000 per annum and that it would be made effective during this fiscal year, provided funds could be made available from our regular appropriation. As to the fiscal year 1941, it will be my purpose to have further consideration given the matter by the Bureau of the Budget, and it is probable that I will discuss it with the President.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Jacob Baker, representing the United Federal Workers, appeared before the committee he brought up the question. In view of General Hines' testimony the point at issue was quickly disposed of. I quote from the hearings:

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I wish to talk very briefly about one particular item in connection with the Veterans' Administration that I imagine is recurrently familiar to all members of this committee. The situation, however, still exists. It concerns a charge made for quarters, subsistence, and laundry—Q. S. and L.—to a great many people who work in the Veterans' Administration who are unable to avail themselves of the service. I might take just a moment as to the history of this matter.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not want to anticipate you, but we have a definite commitment from General Hines, in these hearings, that that is going to be eliminated entirely.

Mr. BAKER. That is splendid.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The only charge made will be for one meal where the employee is working during the day and has to be there for lunch.

Mr. BAKER. That is very splendid.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And I think he said that the charge would be only 25 cents.

Mr. BAKER. That is fine. That actually does relieve the whole situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope General Hines will not delay in correcting the situation complained of. There seems no necessity for reporting the bill referred to, but I can assure the membership of the House the committee will act if it later develops action is necessary.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 378

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, to wit:

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, Michigan.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, New York.

Post Offices and Post Roads: PIUS L. SCHWERT, New York.

World War Veterans' Legislation: ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP, Georgia.

Insular Affairs: JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, Pennsylvania.

Territories: JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, Pennsylvania.

Civil Service: JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, Pennsylvania.

District of Columbia: MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, New York.

Census: MICHAEL J. KENNEDY, New York; JOSEPH R. BRYSON, South Carolina; ED GOSSETT, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The Chair laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 8, 1940.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to submit herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. KENNEDY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The Chair laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 7, 1940.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been selected for membership on the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, I hereby respectfully submit my resignation from the other committees of which I am at present a member, namely, Census, District of Columbia, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, War Claims, and World War Veterans' Legislation.

Very truly yours,

PIUS L. SCHWERT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very brief communication.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very short editorial on the subject of taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND CREDIT MARKET

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to establish an international trade and credit market based on gold for the purpose of circulating and maintaining gold values and to promote trade with Latin America.

The main objective of this bill is to take some of the buried gold out of the ground in Kentucky and put it to work for the American people. It is becoming more and more obvious that if we continue to monopolize and hoard the gold supply of the world it may cease to have international value.

In that case the American taxpayers would be holding the bag to the extent of \$12,000,000,000, an amount equal to the World War debts.

The time has come for a constructive program to save the American people from being mulcted and robbed by foreign gold-producing nations. We have set up a golden calf to worship, which is of no more use to us than the one destroyed by Moses.

The New Deal has blundered blindly into a golden trap of its own setting and has been unable to free itself from its evil consequences. If we continue this mad policy of accumulating gold, such nations as Germany, Italy, and Japan, and other non-gold-producing countries, will say "We can get along on managed currency, and you can keep your buried gold."

My proposal, worked out by Mr. Wolstan Crocker Brown, former monetary adviser to the Republican National Committee, aims primarily to sustain the balance of gold by creating a credit market for exports and imports with Latin America. The plan does not permit the export of gold, but ought to be the means of increasing our trade with Latin America substantially. [Applause.]

AMERICAN FAR EASTERN POLICY

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Japan has had more than 6 months in which to contemplate the termination of a 29-year-old commercial treaty which, after notice to her, expired on January 26, 1940.

The present Sino-Japanese war began on July 7, 1937. Nine days later Secretary Hull issued a broad declaration of the fundamental principles of American foreign policy, and thus Japan has had nearly 3 years to consider the effect of her continued violation of American rights and legitimate interests in China. To date there is no cessation of these acts. On the contrary, the events of each day disclose a continuing and consistent disregard of those treaties and agreements voluntarily entered into by Japan and designed to safeguard national sovereignty and equality of economic opportunity.

I have observed that when the people of this country possess the facts public opinion forms swiftly—and usually it is sound. It is amazing how people here in America have patiently and understandingly followed the long sequel of events leading up to the present state of affairs in the Far East. Beginning with the Nine Power Treaty, signed here at Washington in February of 1922, with Japan a party, Americans have step by step traced developments in Asia until today public opinion, the keystone of this Government, is overwhelmingly in agreement with Mr. John Hay and demands that China be permitted through natural evolutionary processes to gain her liberation. They are taking the long view of the situation, and they are convinced that we are "sowing the wind," in lending our money, our industry, and our political influence to the uses of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, impetuosity has not led them to this conclusion, nor has prejudice played a part. It is a sober judgment of a people who have never condoned tyranny nor failed to indict injustice. A momentous issue of right and wrong confronts the people of America. Shall we continue to be partners with Japan in her unjustifiable invasion of China or shall we refuse henceforth to furnish Japan with materials of war? The time has come for this country to make its decision whether it will give further aid and encouragement to this aggressor. I have an abiding conviction that many of my colleagues voted for the Neutrality Act last year because its intent and purpose was favorable to the nonaggressor nations of Europe. We shall have to decide whether or not our course in Asia in the immediate future shall be for or against the nonaggressor nations. Every Member of this body realized many months ago that when we forsook the application of the time-honored international law in our relationship with the nations of the earth we bade consistency farewell. We have deliberately embarked upon a foreign policy through which we shall henceforth endeavor to search out equity and justice in each problem with which we are confronted, and to make those decisions thereunder which smack not of pious platitudes, but, on the contrary, reflect our determination of finding ways and means to convince the world that this country will not tolerate the aggression of the lawless.

The trend of events in the Orient would have tried the patience of a Job. Americans everywhere have borne, with no small degree, our forbearance with the policies of Japan in China until he who runs may read that Japan has embraced the war philosophy of Germany and Russia. If there is doubt as to this, I refer the House to the following statement from the Japanese War Office. It is that country's definition of what war is:

War is the father of creation and the mother of culture. Rivalry for supremacy does for the state what struggling against adversity does for the individual. It is such impetus, in the one case, as in the other, that prompts the birth and development of life and cultural creation.

I venture to make this prophesy that unless the United States deals swiftly and resolutely with Japan we shall have to endure the chicanery and artful dodging which characterized those familiar events leading up to Munich.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason that this country should deal promptly with this question. Americans will not exhibit

the same degree of forbearance which the British Foreign Office exemplified in its dealings with Hitler. Let us review briefly the successive events in Asia:

First. We laid the cornerstone of American far eastern policy in February 1922 with the signing of the Nine-Power Treaty. Japan was a party to that treaty and solemnly agreed to respect the sovereignty and independence of China, to provide the fullest opportunity for China to develop and maintain herself, to refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights and privileges which would abridge the rights of the Chinese and citizens of friendly states.

Second. In September 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria. The League of Nations and the United States considered possible action.

Third. The then Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, announced the doctrine of nonrecognition, which was concurred in by resolution passed by the League of Nations in 1932.

Fourth. Five years pass and the Sino-Japanese War begins in July of 1937. Mr. Cordell Hull issues a broad declaration of the fundamental principles of American foreign policy, which was communicated to Japan.

Fifth. One month later Mr. Hull issues a public statement reaffirming the previous declaration.

Sixth. One month later China appeals to the League of Nations. The League recommended aid to China.

Seventh. One month later Secretary Hull issues a statement in which the Department of State takes the position that the action of Japan in China is inconsistent with the principles which should govern the relationships between nations and is contrary to the provisions of the Nine Power Treaty of 1922. Thus we named Japan the aggressor.

Eighth. Immediately Japan replies and says, we are not breaking any treaty, we are just trying to get China to abandon her anti-Japanese policy.

Ninth. Approximately another month passes. It is November 1937, and a conference has been called at Brussels with the approval of this country. Nineteen nations attend, among them the United States. Japan does not attend, instead she sends a message that her action in China is purely one of self-defense and especially because of the provocative action of China in resorting to force of arms.

Tenth. One month later Japanese military aircraft bombed and sank the U. S. S. *Panay*; 2 days thereafter the Japanese Government expressed regret, admitted responsibility, and offered amends.

Eleventh. One month later our Ambassador, Mr. Grew, is writing notes to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs protesting and demanding that the disregard of American property rights and disrespect for the flag cease.

Twelfth. One month later the Japanese Minister Hirota writes our Ambassador that this Government is studying how they can elaborate effective and adequate measures that as soon as possible may put a definite stop to the occurrence of similar events.

Meantime the bombing of civilians goes on in China and Acting Secretary Welles in June of 1938 pens a note to the Japanese Government reiterating this Government's reprobation of ruthless bombing of unfortified localities with the resultant slaughter of women and children, and characterized such methods as barbarous.

In November the world is treated to a rather remarkable document. It is a note from the Japanese Minister to Mr. Grew in which Japan proclaims a "new order" in the Orient.

We are told that Japan at present is devoting her energies to the establishment of a new order based on genuine international justice throughout east Asia, the attainment of which end is not only an indispensable condition to the very existence of Japan, but also constitutes the foundation of an enduring peace and the stability of east Asia. Apparently this new order is to grow out of the benevolent usages of explosives and implements of war in the hands of a ruthless invader.

The American Ambassador in a note to the Japanese Minister in December of 1938 rejected Japan's new order, and

stated to the Japanese Government that the United States is well aware that many of the changes in China have been brought about by action by Japan, and that this Government does not admit that there is need or warrant for any one power to take upon itself to prescribe what shall be the terms and conditions of a new order in areas not under its sovereignty, and to constitute itself the repository of authority and the agent of destiny. Following this note no noticeable change in Japanese policy has been made in China. In October of 1939, Mr. Grew, in an address before the America-Japan Society in Tokyo, informed the Japanese people that Americans believe that an effort is being made to establish control, in Japan's own interest, of large areas on the continent of Asia, and to impose upon these areas a system of closed economy. He likewise informed the Japanese people that Americans have been profoundly shocked over the bombing in China not only on the grounds of humanity but also on the grounds of direct menace to American lives and property, and the interference with American rights by Japanese armed forces in utter disregard of treaties and agreements existing between the two countries.

One other event has transpired since October, and that was the expiration of the trade treaty in January of this year. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the Japanese Government now occupies an anxious seat as indicated by Ambassador Hironouchi's inquiry no longer than this week as to whether or not after January 26 there will be any change in American duties and tonnage rates now imposed upon Japanese imports, and secondly, whether there is any possibility of an exchange of notes between the two Governments defining immediately the future status of trade relations, and lastly, what will be the position of Japanese merchants who have been doing business in the United States under the old treaty's provisions. It would appear that the policy of this Government at the moment is that our trade relations with Japan will remain on a day-to-day basis, but that does not suffice if the day-to-day basis permits the continued sale of scrap iron and other munitions of war to this aggressor nation.

As an illustration of the willful, headlong course of Japan, I refer the membership of this House to its last act to date. The French-owned railroad from Indochina to Yunnan Province is about the last remaining medium over which American exports to and imports from China can pass without first asking the permission of Japan. Within the past week representatives of this Government have pointed out to Tokyo the harmful effect upon American trade with China of the continued bombing of this railroad by Japanese planes. The Japanese Government has not paid the slightest attention to our request.

Then, again, according to the latest news bulletins, a recent sale of 300,000 bushels of wheat has been made to Japan carrying a 30-cents-a-bushel United States Government subsidy. Can it be possible that while the State Department is doing all that it can to bolster a "moral embargo" on airplanes and bombs, the Department of Agriculture is going about the business of filling the stomachs of the pilots of those bombers?

These things have happened since or at about the time of the expiration of our trade treaty with Japan. And they evidence a Japan so far unimpressed either with the representations or protests of our State Department. The Japanese mind is quick to discern these inconsistencies and to note our willingness to go on protesting from month to month. The Congress wishes to move with care and caution in its consideration of this matter—it does not wish to impede or embarrass the State Department in the handling of this problem, but I believe I express the thoughts of the great majority of my colleagues when I say we have a real stake in the Orient, and we cannot afford to shut our eyes to the possibility of a great Japanese Empire stretching away from Siberia to Singapore.

It is highly significant that Japan should continue now to ignore our protests.

Pending in the Congress are at least four bills proposing to prohibit the export by us to Japan of arms, munitions, and the raw materials out of which they are manufac-

tured. Let the State Department deal with this matter if it can. Negotiation will not accomplish the desired results; we have been negotiating since 1922. We are unwittingly fattening the war lords of Japan at the expense of the Japanese people themselves. We are the fabricators of a Japanese menace—a menace built upon American exports. Day by day we build the Japanese Navy and then hunt anxiously for the millions of dollars necessary to build our own battleships to defend our shores.

I believe it to be the wish of the House that the State Department shall inform the Japanese Government of what is expected henceforth of it, and that this should be done early enough in the present session for the State Department to derive the full benefit of legislative action if necessary. Already there is every sign that the Japanese regard our bark as much worse than our bite. Without a more positive American policy, at least to the extent of withholding economic aid to Japan, the present conflict will rage for years. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KITCHENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a letter to me from the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, on the subject of trade agreements and the woolen industry, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a letter to me from R. G. Phillips, secretary of the International Apple Association, on the subject of trade agreements and the fresh-fruit industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Secretary of Commerce Hopkins in reply to a letter from Senator TOBEY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters, one written by me and one written to me, on the subject of the Negro's part in American history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Elections No. 2 may be permitted to sit today during the sessions of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York if that is agreeable to the minority members of the committee.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Yes; it is agreeable to all the members, majority and minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I find that the material I attempted to insert in the RECORD yesterday regarding the National Youth Administration and its work at the University of Minnesota amounts to four and one-half pages. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that this exceeds the regular limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The material does not consist of editorials or magazine articles?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; it is a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein quotations from the letters of Benjamin Franklin and from the daily papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

UTOPIA IS IN MINNESOTA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that South Dakota is a sunshine State. Of course, no one disagrees with the gentleman's statement. However, we have just as fine sunshine in Minnesota, and in addition to that we have 10,000 lakes. We have also suspected for a long time that we have Utopia there, but we have never had exact and definite proof of it before, until we found out that we have a village there that is a veritable Utopia.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hold in my hand a very unusual story. It is unusual because it is about a village in my congressional district in Minnesota in which there are no debts, no taxes, and nobody is on relief. Think of it—no debts, taxes, or relief. Can anyone anywhere else in the United States equal that record? Or shall we challenge the whole world?

The village is Long Lake. It is located on one of the most picturesque of Minnesota's 10,000 beautiful lakes and is only a step over the ridge from world-famed Minnetonka, the lake whose sky-blue waters have been made famous in song and verse and Indian legend.

Mr. RANKIN. Any property? Anybody live there?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have in my hand pictures of the village. It is a very beautiful village, located on one of the most beautiful of our 10,000 lakes. These pictures, here attached to this news article, are of the business district, and of the mayor, W. L. Hursh; of Kenneth Bollum, bank cashier and village clerk; William Bottean, feed-store operator and village trustee; Ross J. Johnston, village council member; "Kipp" Hale, owner of the Buckhorn cafe, and of D. J. Albee, grocer and village trustee, who are all real flesh-and-blood people and who are responsible for this village's excellent condition of affairs.

A short time ago Kenneth Bollum, the village clerk, made the assertion in a public meeting which I attended, that there was no depression, and that business in Long Lake was very good. Read the following article and you will get some idea of what he evidently had in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record and include therein the article which accompanies these pictures.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if that is one of the Government-constructed villages.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No. It is the result of natural growth.

Mr. RICH. I did not think it was.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This village needs no help from the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if the village to which he refers is Hibbing, Minn.?

Mr. ALEXANDER. This is Long Lake, Minn., and it is located in my congressional district.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is that on the Mesabe Iron Range?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; it is just outside of Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NO DEBT, NO TAXES, NOBODY ON RELIEF—SOUNDS LIKE UTOPIA; IT'S LONG LAKE, MINN.

(By Lewis C. Mills, Star-Journal Staff Writer)

Listen, you property owners, clutching your tax statements in one hand and a crying towel in the other—

There is a municipality in Hennepin County, Minn., within a 30-minute drive of Minneapolis, where there are no local taxes.

There has been no local levy for 5 years.

Although the village has been incorporated for over 30 years it has no debt and there never has been a bond issue.

There is no public relief.

The village council actually takes in more money than it can spend, and members now are mulling over a plan to eliminate school district, county, and State taxes.

Eventually they even may be able to pay residents a small amount for living there.

Hold on there, now—there can't be any such place.

I didn't think so, either, until I talked with W. L. Hursh, Minneapolis attorney and president of the Long Lake council.

Long Lake is a village of some 250, situated 16 miles west of Minneapolis.

According to Mr. Hursh, it is a typical Minnesota village in all respects except its freedom from debt and taxes.

He claims further that any village could eliminate location taxation by the simple process of spending no more than it takes in.

The trouble with most other municipalities is that they also have a relief problem.

There is no relief problem in Long Lake.

"We have had some people who thought the village should support them," Mr. Hursh said, "but we always have been able to find some responsible relative or some other method of taking care of them."

Long Lake receives no aid from the county, State, or Federal Governments; there is no distribution of surplus commodities and no W. P. A. or P. W. A. work.

Now for the plan to eliminate all taxes.

This is a sort of delicate subject, because the plan involves the Long Lake municipal liquor store—and Mr. Hursh is a dry.

The people voted slightly over 2 years ago to have liquor in the village, and a municipal liquor store has been operating since March 6, 1938.

From then to December 31, 1939, the liquor store showed a net profit of \$6,500—more cash money than the village had handled in 5 or 6 ordinary years.

One proposal is for the village to buy up all the property in town, thus removing it from the tax rolls, but permitting the original owners to continue to occupy the property as caretakers. That would eliminate all property taxes.

Then, as the surplus continued to accumulate, each "caretaker" might be paid a reasonable sum for "looking after" the village property.

It sounds silly, and the village probably won't do it, but Mr. Hursh insists County Auditor Al Erickson has been unable to find any flaw in the plan.

Mr. Hursh salves his dry conscience with the comment that the liquor store is patronized principally by visitors from Minneapolis or tourists passing through.

RECORD COLD WEATHER IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the gentleman is now going to give us some information about the power rates?

Mr. RANKIN. I will do that a little later; I am saving that for another address. I will show the gentleman then what the T. V. A. and the R. E. A. are doing for the people of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman going to talk about that picket line the gentleman and I go through every day?

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to hear the gentleman from Michigan on it first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield, so I can be heard now?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I will not yield now. The gentleman can speak later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have had two speeches in the last 2 days about the weather, one from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and one from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]. It seems to me the normal weather, in both South Dakota and Minnesota, has disappeared, and I am going to tell you what has become of it. It went down to Mississippi for the time being. We are now ready to return it with interest.

My home district has been under a sheet of snow ranging from 9 to 24 inches deep and the thermometer has been below zero. I had a letter this morning from a friend of mine at Macon, Miss., which is in latitude 33°, who said that they had had a 24-inch snow and that the thermometer went to 11°

below zero. In my home town of Tupelo, Miss., this Minnesota weather that has escaped from that State, and from South Dakota, took the thermometer 14° below zero, which is the coldest in all history. In 1887 the thermometer went to 11° below zero at Tupelo, and in 1899 it went to 11° below zero, but this is the first time it has ever reached as low as 14° below zero. In 1887 there was no snow with the zero weather, and in 1899 there was only 3 or 4 inches of snow. This time the snow ranged from about 9 inches at Tupelo to 24 inches at Macon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a schedule showing the temperature at Aberdeen, Miss., which is also in my district, for the entire month of January 1940.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman that it will be perfectly all right to return the cold weather if the gentleman will send along the 24 inches of snow?

Mr. RANKIN. I would be glad to send both, I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota, for we have an ample rainfall in that area and do not need the extra moisture, as they do in South Dakota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, you will note from the following temperature readings, taken from the Aberdeen Examiner, that the thermometer never got above the freezing point at Aberdeen, Miss., during the entire month of January, which I am sure is a record for that locality for all time.

Those readings are as follows:

Jan. 1.....	32 above
Jan. 2.....	20 above
Jan. 3.....	16 above
Jan. 4.....	24 above
Jan. 5.....	28 above
Jan. 6.....	19 above
Jan. 7.....	32 above
Jan. 8.....	30 above
Jan. 9.....	19 above
Jan. 10.....	32 above
Jan. 11.....	32 above
Jan. 12.....	32 above
Jan. 13.....	32 above
Jan. 14.....	32 above
Jan. 15.....	26 above
Jan. 16.....	20 above
Jan. 17.....	29 above
Jan. 18.....	26 above
Jan. 19.....	3 above
Jan. 20.....	9 above
Jan. 21.....	15 above
Jan. 22.....	14 above
Jan. 23.....	27 above
(8 inches of snow)	
Jan. 24.....	10 above
Jan. 25.....	10 above
Jan. 26.....	2 below
Jan. 27.....	10 below
Jan. 28.....	6 below
Jan. 29.....	25 above
Jan. 30.....	23 above
Jan. 31.....	13 above

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a very able and informative address by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the Members of the House that tomorrow H. R. 960, a bill which, if passed, would blanket in practically from 250,000 to 300,000 people into the civil service, is coming up. I want to

remind the membership of the House that at the present time there are 480,000 people on the civil-service eligible register in the District, and 500,000 people all over the country are on the eligible civil-service list, making a total of nearly 1,000,000 who are eligible civil-service workers who are not now employed in the Government.

I earnestly hope that the bill, if it cannot be amended to include open, competitive examinations for the civil service, will not be passed tomorrow. Think of the injustice to the nearly 1,000,000 eligible civil-service workers all over the country. They worked for their examinations; they won their spurs, and yet if these non-civil-service persons are blanketed in, how manifestly unfair that will be. The examinations should be open, competitive examinations. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MORE ABOUT THE WEATHER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, referred to the remarks of my friend from Mississippi, I may add that I have had a letter from the folks at Hot Springs, S. Dak., where they saw the thermometer change 80 degrees inside of 24 hours, going from 30 below to 50 above. These vagaries of the weather inspired the columnist in the Rapid City Daily Journal the other day to observe that some fears had been expressed that snow would cave in the dome of the Capitol. The writer said, however, that he had no fears on that score as long as Congress is in session to "raise the roof." [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein certain definitions of parity offered by the Sioux City Tribune.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would tell us how that place got the name of Hot Springs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Warm springs and streams make it the South Dakota banana belt where such a thing is possible. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. DEROUEN (when the Committee on Public Lands was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee I may state that the committee has five more or less minor bills that we expect to call up.

I first call up, Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 5688) to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project, near Dumfries, Va., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DEROUEN. I will be very pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker.

This proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to operate recreational facilities within the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project located in Prince William and Stafford Counties, near Dumfries, Va., transferred to the said Secretary under the provisions of

Executive Order No. 7496, dated November 14, 1936, as part of the park system of the National Capital and its environs.

The area, which was very poor farm land, is located within 35 miles of Washington and constitutes an ideal recreational and camping area which is needed for organized camping facilities for various social service and other organizations such as the Associated Charities of Washington. Because of the lack of camping and recreational facilities in the National Capital, the development of the Chopawamsic area is endorsed by all of the social-service agencies of Washington and the various organizations dealing with youth movement.

During the period from October 1, 1937, to September 30, 1938, the area, which is in the process of development and consequently has but limited facilities, accommodated 1,876 campers and collected for the use of the facilities \$2,479.50 which sum was deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. These campers represented the Boy Scouts, the Jewish Community Center, the Y. M. C. A., the Council of Social Agencies, the District of Columbia Cooperative League, and other local organizations.

Through the emergency conservation work program, camping facilities to serve approximately 7,500 people each season will be developed. The enlargement of the camp to meet the needs of the National Capital in this respect will result in an increase of revenue from the use of the facilities, and will necessitate the employment of a number of permanent employees for the maintenance, protection, and operation of the camp.

In the event it is found advantageous to operate the camping facilities indirectly, it is desired to have authority to enter into a contract or contracts with organizations such as the Community Chest, the Community Center, the Boys' Clubs, and so forth, or with reliable and qualified individuals. It is provided that the receipts derived from the operations of these recreational facilities shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the lands comprising the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7496, dated November 14, 1936, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service as part of the park system of the National Capital and its environs.

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized—

(a) To prescribe and collect fees and charges for such recreational and other facilities, conveniences, and services as may be furnished by the National Park Service for the accommodation of the public within the said area.

(b) To enter into a contract or contracts with any reliable person, organization, or corporation, without advertising and without securing competitive bids for the operation or performance of any such recreational or other facilities, conveniences, and services within the said area.

All revenues collected by the National Park Service, pursuant to the authority of this section, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to exercise and perform with respect to the said area all the powers and duties that are conferred and imposed upon him by law in relation to the construction, maintenance, care, custody, policing, upkeep, and repair of the public buildings and parks in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITATION OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS IN NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2624) to amend the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 460), as amended, with regard to the limitation of cost upon the construction of buildings in national parks, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitation of cost upon the construction of any administration or other building in any national park without express authority of Congress, contained in the act approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 460), as amended by the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 677), is hereby increased from \$1,500 to \$3,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Does that give the Department the right to increase the construction cost of any particular buildings from \$1,500 to \$3,000?

Mr. DEROUEN. Not necessarily. It does this: The construction facilities in the various parks throughout the United States have not been reviewed and increased in 21 years—not since 1918. The first act of 1912 fixed the limitation at \$1,000 on this type of construction. The construction is for the repair of buildings, and buildings of small facilities. Then, in July 1918, the limitation was raised to \$1,500. Therefore 21 years elapsed, when the cost of materials and labor very greatly increased.

Mr. RICH. Does it state that the Department has the right to increase the cost of buildings?

Mr. DEROUEN. The Congress fixed the limitation at \$1,500, not higher.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman does not mean to say that we have not spent any money on parks? We have spent more money on parks in the last 7 years than had been theretofore spent on parks in the last 50 years.

Mr. DEROUEN. That may be true. I have not any remarks to make about that; but I do feel this is justified because the cost of construction and labor has increased. Therefore we should do it in this case, because we have done it for the other departments.

Mr. RICH. What we have to do is to be careful that we do not give the departments discretionary power to spend more and more money, because the gentleman will find that the cost of the upkeep of the parks that he has established and increased the size of in the last 5 years will be a great burden on the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. To say this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]: No construction can be done at all without a special appropriation for it, regardless of the fact that the limit of cost is increased from \$1,500 to \$3,000. There would have to be special appropriation by Congress just the same.

Mr. DEROUEN. That is true.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. And what type of buildings are these?

Mr. DEROUEN. These are small buildings.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Shelters, and so forth?

Mr. DEROUEN. Shelters, and so forth; accommodations for the public. Those that we have there now are dilapidated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE OF BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4282, to amend the act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2041), providing for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall not object, but I do this for the purpose of calling to the attention of the membership the fact that the

microphones used on this floor are not being properly amplified so that the voices of those who speak into them can be heard by the other Members. I trust the gentleman who handles that will see to it that the voice is amplified to a greater extent than is now being done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what this bill is about.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation would extend the same provisions of law to the Blue Ridge Parkway which were extended by Congress over the Natchez Trace Parkway by the act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 407). The administration of both the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways has been placed under the jurisdiction of this Department, and under the terms of this proposed legislation uniform provisions of law would apply to both parkways.

Under the proposal herein recommended the Blue Ridge Parkway Act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2041), would be amended in two particulars: First, by authorizing the extension of the width of the parkway beyond the 200-foot limit prescribed in the above-mentioned act, where the parkway runs through Government-owned lands and where small parcels of Government-owned lands would otherwise be isolated, or where topographic conditions or scenic requirements are such that bridges, ditches, cuts, fills, parking overlooks, and landscape development could not reasonably be confined to a width of 200 feet; second, the above-mentioned act would be amended by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way across and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands for such purposes and under such nondiscriminatory terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

In some instances a relatively small parcel of land under the administration of another department is isolated or segregated from the main reservation by projecting the parkway through such reservation and, as administrative difficulties are frequently encountered by the department or agency having a small portion of its lands so isolated or separated from the main reservation, it may in some cases be preferred to administer such small parcels of land as a part of the parkway. In some instances the topography of the land will not permit parkway standards to be maintained on a width of only 200 feet. This is particularly true when extensive ditches, cuts, and fills are necessary. In addition, scenic requirements cannot be maintained on a 200-foot limitation in the width of the parkway.

The construction of the Blue Ridge Parkway was commenced under the authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (49 Stat. 195). After the parkway rights-of-way had been conveyed to the United States it became apparent that it would be in the interest of the United States to authorize former landowners and adjacent landowners to use parkway lands for agricultural and residential purposes where such uses were not inconsistent with the parkway development program. In other cases it was necessary to authorize the use of parkway lands for ingress and egress by adjacent landowners whose lands had been severed by the parkway. It was also found necessary to permit the use of parkway lands for public-utility crossings. While the parkway lands were administered pursuant to the terms of the National Industrial Recovery Act, there was authority to authorize the use of parkway lands for these purposes. However, the Blue Ridge Parkway is now being administered and maintained, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1936, by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and it is doubtful whether the parkway lands may be authorized to be used for the purposes described above. The proposed legislation, in addition to authorizing the widening of the parkway in certain cases,

would remove existing doubt as to the authority to grant leases and licenses for the stated purposes.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the gentleman, if you are going to grant this permission to the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Natchez Trace to extend that width beyond 200 feet, what does the Public Lands Committee feel will be necessary for the Federal Government to do to improve it as is planned by the parkway?

Mr. DEROUEN. I do not think this adds anything. This really is facilitating and aiding the two agencies, because the development does not require any additional land. This land is Government-owned. This is merely correlating the two agencies of the Department of Agriculture in all of these lands.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am quite familiar with what is involved in this bill. From the Department's standpoint, it is just an administrative matter. In the first place, it gives the Department the same powers it now has with respect to the Natchez Trace—that is in some instances if their plans for recreational development might require a little more than the 200 feet—and it only deals with public lands, mind you.

Mr. RICH. It only deals with public lands?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right. The Forest Service could let them go over a few feet; or this parkway might strike a piece of forest land that leaves a little triangle, and the Forest Service would much prefer to have the Park Service administer it. It involves no additional expense or financing of any kind. It is administrative. But from the standpoint of the people of Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee there is a vital provision in this bill in which we are deeply interested. It has been the practice of the Park Service to limit the crossing right of the Blue Ridge Parkway to those roads reserved as crossing roads in the deeds of conveyance from the States to the Federal Government. That has shut off a lot of private adjoining landowners who had private roads that they used to go out with. This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant revocable permits to that private landowner to cross the Blue Ridge Parkway to get out with his farm products and with his normal travel.

Mr. RICH. Then you are not going to block the private owner from getting across the parkway?

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is to permit them to get out and that is the reason we are so vitally interested. We have a lot of them tied up right now.

Mr. RICH. Are you figuring on making any overhead crossings to speak of that will cost additional funds?

Mr. ROBERTSON. None whatever. Of course, the Park Service has been insisting on the State highway department, when they convey a right-of-way that excludes some adjoining landowner from his normal outlet, to provide him an outlet somewhere else. But that has frequently proven to be expensive. However, if there is any additional expense, it falls upon the State and not upon the Federal Government. This merely authorizes overhead crossings at grade level.

Mr. RICH. As far as the Federal Government is concerned, you figure that because of this bill you are not going to put any more burdens on the Federal Government for the Natchez Trace and Blue Ridge Parkway?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are not going to put any financial burdens on, but we are going to lift what we think are some unnecessary restrictions upon the people.

Mr. RICH. Well, the people who wanted this were the people in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. You fellows came in here with tears in your eyes and got us to make this appropriation. Now you find you have got yourselves into a little trouble and you want to get out the best way you can. But what we want to know is that the people in Pennsylvania

are not going to pay any more for your people down there to be accommodated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not one red cent.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I think I will object. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what more burden do you want than the few hundred millions that are already authorized?

Mr. RICH. I do not want any burden.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is one of the crimes of the ages—this Natchez Trace and Skyline Drive. Now the Government has built enough miles of the Skyline Drive for the people of Washington and the tourists to ride over and see the Blue Ridge Mountains on their crest. It is one of the wildest dreams of the New Deal that we ever authorized this thing—500 miles long to the Great Smoky Mountains and the Natchez Trace hooked up with it. The first crime came when the money was taken from relief money without authorization. I think this whole thing and the expenditures that we are fixing on the United States for its future is one of the crimes of the last few years, and I object to anything that facilitates it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman only objects to dispensing with further reading of the bill. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2041), be amended to read as follows:

"That all lands and easements heretofore or hereafter conveyed to the United States by the States of Virginia and North Carolina for the right-of-way for the projected parkway between the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks, together with sites acquired or to be acquired for recreational areas in connection therewith, and a right-of-way for said parkway of a width sufficient to include the highway and all bridges, ditches, cuts, and fills appurtenant thereto, but not exceeding a maximum of 200 feet through Government-owned lands (except that where small parcels of Government-owned lands would otherwise be isolated, or where topographic conditions or scenic requirements are such that bridges, ditches, cuts, fills, parking overlooks, and landscape development, could not reasonably be confined to a width of 200 feet, the said maximum may be increased to such width as may be necessary, with the written approval of the department or agency having jurisdiction over such lands) as designated on maps heretofore or hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be known as the Blue Ridge Parkway and shall be administered and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," the provisions of which act, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended over and made applicable to said parkway: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, to connect with the parkway such roads and trails as may be necessary for the protection, administration, or utilization of adjacent and nearby national forests and the resources thereof: *And provided further*, That the Forest Service and the National Park Service shall, insofar as practicable, coordinate and correlate such recreational development as each may plan, construct, or permit to be constructed, on lands within their respective jurisdictions which, by mutual agreement, should be given special treatment for recreational purposes.

"Sec. 2. In the administration of the Blue Ridge Parkway, the Secretary of the Interior may issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way over, across, and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands, for such purposes and under such nondiscriminatory terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to approve and accept, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands and interests in land heretofore or hereafter conveyed to the United States for the purposes of the Blue Ridge or the Natchez Trace Parkways, or for recreational areas in connection therewith."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "and", and after the word "development" insert "recreational and other facilities requisite to public use of said parkway."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to the passage of the bill if it is proper to do so now, or shall object to it at the proper time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is not a question of unanimous consent. The bill is called up under Calendar Wednesday rules in the regular way.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6813) to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, approved March 18, 1929, and the act of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, approved April 12, 1929, ceding to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over and within certain lands within said States as may be acquired for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park are hereby accepted and sole and exclusive jurisdiction is hereby assumed by the United States over such lands, saving, however, to the State of North Carolina and to the State of Tennessee, respectively, the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the area ceded by such State in suits or prosecutions for or on account of any rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in such State outside of said park; and saving further to each such State the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property on the lands included in such ceded area; and saving also to the persons residing in said park now, or hereafter, the right to vote at all elections held within the county in which they reside; and saving further to each such State the right to tax sales in such ceded area of gasoline and other motor-vehicle fuels and oil for use in motor vehicles. All laws applicable to places under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, including section 289 of the Criminal Code, as amended (18 U. S. C. 468), shall have force and effect in said park. All fugitives from justice taking refuge in said park shall be subject to the same laws as refugees from justice found in either the State of North Carolina or Tennessee.

Sec. 2. That the portion of said park located in the State of North Carolina shall constitute a part of the United States judicial district for the western district of North Carolina and the portion of said park located in the State of Tennessee shall constitute a part of the United States judicial district for the eastern district of Tennessee, and the district court of the United States in and for each such district shall have jurisdiction over all offenses committed within the ceded area of the said park in such district.

Sec. 3. That all hunting or the killing, wounding, or capturing at any time of any wild bird or animal, except dangerous animals when it is necessary to prevent them from destroying human lives or inflicting personal injury, is prohibited within the limits of said park; nor shall any fish be taken out of any of the waters of the said park, in any other way than by hook and line, and then only at such seasons and at such times and in such manner as may be directed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such general rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for the management and care of the park and for the protection of the property therein, especially for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within said park, and for the protection of the animals and birds in the park from capture or destruction, and to prevent their being frightened or driven from the said park; and he shall make rules and regulations governing the taking of fish from the streams or lakes in the said park. Possession within said park of the dead bodies or any part thereof of any wild bird or animal shall be prima facie evidence that the person or persons having the same are guilty of violating this act. Any person or persons, stage or express company, railway or other transportation company, who knows or has reason to believe that such wild birds, fish, or animals were taken or killed contrary to the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, and who receives for transportation the dead bodies or any part thereof of the wild birds, fish, or animals so taken or killed, or who shall violate any of the other provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations, with reference to the management and care of the said park, or for the protection of the property therein for the preservation from injury or spoliation of timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonderful objects within said park, or for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in said park, or who shall within said park commit any damage, injury, or spoliation to or upon any building, frame, sign, hedge, gate, guidepost, tree, wood, underwood, timber, garden, crops, vegetables, plants, land, springs, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or other matter or

thing growing or being thereon, or situated therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both, and be adjudged to pay all the costs of the proceedings.

Sec. 4. That all guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or means of transportation of every nature or description used by any person or persons within the limits of said park when engaged in killing, trapping, ensnaring, taking, or capturing such wild birds, fish, or animals contrary to the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be forfeited to the United States and may be seized by the officers in said park and held pending prosecution of any person or persons arrested under the charge of violating the provisions of this act, and upon conviction under this act of such person or persons using said guns, traps, nets, seines, fishing tackle, teams, horses, or other means of transportation, such forfeiture shall be adjudicated as a penalty in addition to the other punishment prescribed in this act. Such forfeited property shall be disposed of and accounted for by and under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the forfeiture of teams, horses, or other means of transportation shall be in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 5. That upon the recommendation and approval of the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina and the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee shall jointly appoint a commissioner, who shall have jurisdiction to hear and act upon all complaints made of any violations of law or of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior for the government of the park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish, and objects of interest therein, and for other purposes, authorized by this act. Such commissioner shall have power, upon sworn information, to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with the commission of any misdemeanor, or charged with a violation of the rules and regulations, or with a violation of any of the provisions of this act prescribed for the government of said park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish in said park, and to try the person so charged, and, if found guilty, to impose punishment and to adjudge the forfeiture prescribed. In all cases of conviction an appeal shall lie from the judgment of said commissioner to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, or the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, respectively, depending upon the district in which the particular land in said park on which the offense shall have taken place is located; and the United States district courts in the aforementioned districts shall jointly prescribe the rules of procedure and practice for said commissioner in the trial of cases and for appeal to said United States district courts.

Sec. 6. That such of the United States commissioners for the western judicial district of North Carolina and the eastern judicial district of Tennessee as may be designated for the purpose, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, by the respective district courts for such districts shall have authority to exercise the same jurisdiction with respect to offenses against law and the rules and regulations made in pursuance thereof, committed within their respective judicial districts, as the park commissioner provided for in this act is authorized to exercise.

Sec. 7. That the park commissioner provided for in this act shall also have power to issue process as hereinbefore provided for the arrest of any person charged with the commission within said park of any criminal offense not covered by the provisions of section 3 of this act, to hear the evidence introduced, and, if he is of the opinion that probable cause is shown for holding the person so charged for trial, shall commit such person for further appropriate action, and certify a transcript of the record of his proceedings and the testimony in such case to the particular district court, which court shall have jurisdiction of the case: *Provided*, That the said commissioner may grant bail in all cases according to the laws of the United States.

Sec. 8. That process issued by such commissioner shall be directed to the marshal of the United States for the western district of North Carolina or for the eastern district of Tennessee, as the case may be, but nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent the arrest by any officer or employee of the Government or any person employed by the United States, without process, of any person taken in the act of violating the law or this act or the regulations prescribed by the said Secretary as aforesaid.

Sec. 9. That the park commissioner provided for in this act shall be paid an annual salary, as appropriated for by Congress: *Provided*, That the said commissioner shall reside within the exterior boundaries of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park or at a place reasonably adjacent to the park, the place of residence to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 10. That all fees, costs, and expenses arising in cases under this act and properly chargeable to the United States shall be certified, approved, and paid as are like fees, costs, and expenses in the courts of the United States.

Sec. 11. That all fees, fines, and costs and expenses imposed and collected shall be deposited by the commissioner, or by the marshal of the United States collecting the same, with the clerk of the respective United States district courts for either the western district of North Carolina or the eastern district of Tennessee, depending upon the district in which the offense for which collection is made shall have taken place.

Sec. 12. That the Secretary of the Interior shall notify in writing the Governors of the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of

the passage and approval of this act, and of the fact that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over said park as specified in said acts of the States of North Carolina and Tennessee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6658) to authorize the lease or sale of certain public lands in Alaska, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sections numbered 16 and 36 in Tps. 17 and 18 N., Rs. 1 and 2 E. Seward meridian, Alaska, are hereby released from the reservation thereof made by the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), for the support of the common schools in the Territory of Alaska, and in lieu of the lands so released an equal area of vacant, nonmineral, surveyed, unreserved, public lands in the Territory of Alaska may be designated and reserved for the support of the common schools in the Territory of Alaska in the manner provided by the act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. 796), as amended.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to lease, or to sell at not less than \$1.25 per acre, under such rules and regulations and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the lands released from reservation by section 1 of this act and the public lands in Tps. 17 and 18 N., Rs. 1 and 2 E.; secs. 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, T. 17 N., R. 1 W.; secs. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, T. 16 N., R. 1 W.; secs. 1 to 11 and 12, T. 16 N., R. 2 W., Seward meridian, Alaska: *Provided, however*, That all patents and leases issued under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and other mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. The provisions of this section are subject to valid existing rights.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the parenthesis, strike out the comma and the word "as" and insert a period.

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "amended," and the period.

Page 2, strike out all of line 11 and insert in lieu thereof, "16 north, range 1 west; sections 1, 2, 11, and 12, township."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7252) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to appraise and sell, or to lease, to any incorporated city or town in Alaska, for park or recreational purposes, not to exceed 160 acres of vacant and unreserved public lands in the Territory, which, in his opinion, are reasonably accessible to such city or town, and to appraise and sell to any such city or town, for cemetery purposes, not to exceed 80 acres of such land: *Provided*, That each patent issued under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the coal and other mineral deposits in the land conveyed, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 2. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the act of September 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 502), shall not apply to the Territory of Alaska.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, that completes the business of the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address on the American aviation industry today by Col. John H. Jewett, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, Inc., delivered January 27, 1940, over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was allotted 30 minutes in which to address the House today at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day. Has the legislative program been concluded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It has not.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

FEBRUARY 7, 1940.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Herewith I wish to tender my resignation from the following committees: World War Veterans' Legislation, District of Columbia, Insular Affairs, Patents, and Census, in order to become a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Cordially yours,

RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, M. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On January 31, 1940:

H. J. Res. 419. Joint resolution to extend, for 3 additional months, the time during which articles imported free of duty for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition or the New York World's Fair may be sold or abandoned.

On February 1, 1940:

H. R. 7293. An act to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make permissive the acquisition of legislative jurisdiction over land or interests in land acquired by the United States.

H. R. 7342. An act to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8319) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and for the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8319, State, Commerce, Justice, and the judiciary appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. BEAM in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For Secretary of State—Under Secretary of State, \$10,000; Counselor, \$10,000; and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including temporary employees, and not to exceed \$6,500 for employees engaged on piece work at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of State; \$2,450,000: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment of personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the four Assistant Secretaries of State and the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, the Assistant to the Attorney General, the Assistant Solicitor General, and six Assistant Attorneys General, the Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, or (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 2, line 8, strike out "\$2,450,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,458,000."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to make this figure allowed the State Department conform to that given other departments of the Government.

The Committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, ambassadors and ministers: For salaries of ambassadors and ministers, including salaries as authorized by section 1740, Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 583), as follows: Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Poland, Spain, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Venezuela, at \$17,500 each.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 6, line 10, after the word "Turkey", strike out the words "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are two other amendments relating to this particular subject, one on page 7 and the other on page 17, which I expect to offer. It seems to me it would be advisable to consider these three amendments together because they cover the same subject matter, and if we offer the three of them together, instead of having the three different amendments offered three times and having three fights, we can have the question settled on one occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the other two amendments may be reported for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the other two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 3, strike out "\$660,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$642,500."

Page 17, after line 14, insert "Provided, That no appropriation contained under the caption 'foreign intercourse' shall be used for the maintenance of an embassy of the United States in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or for salaries or any character of expense, other than salaries, for the maintenance of any office or officer of the United States State Department in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that these three amendments may be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I see no objection to discussing the three amendments at this time and confining the discussion of those amendments to this particular time, with the provision that when those points are reached in the bill the amendments will be voted upon without further discussion. With that understanding I am perfectly content to go along and discuss them now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree to that. I think the three amendments are in fact only one amendment. It is necessary to offer three different amendments because the particular matter to be amended is contained on three different pages of the bill. We ought to vote on them on only one occasion or else we will have separate fights on each one of them.

Mr. CALDWELL. I think perhaps we would be willing to discuss all of them at this time and vote on the amendments without further discussion later, but it would be proper to take them up only one at a time.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me this is for the gentleman's own benefit. I am offering this unanimous-consent request for the benefit of the gentleman who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think these amendments should be taken up in the order in which we reach them, thus disposing of them in the regular orderly way.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right. I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Are we going to have an opportunity to discuss the amendment which the gentleman intends to propose? I would like to be heard.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the gentlemen in charge of the bill on both sides whether liberal debate will be had in view of the fact this is a very important amendment? It has to do with the question of recognition of Soviet Russia, nothing else or nothing more. It is a matter that should be discussed in detail on its merits and demerits. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to have more than 5 minutes to present this matter, and others who want to be heard should have ample time.

Mr. CALDWELL. I may say to the gentleman that this is not the place for the matter to be taken up, nor should it be considered here. This is not the bill under which we should discuss whether we are going to recognize or fail to recognize Russia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not yielding for the gentleman from Florida to make his argument in my time. The question had to do with liberal debate. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1½ minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Chair to state the time remaining for the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has eight and a half minutes remaining.

Mr. CALDWELL. What was the unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked unanimous consent to proceed for an additional one and a half minutes. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have no objection, but I shall object to any further extension of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important and a very serious matter. In offering these amendments I do so only after profound consideration.

The purpose of the pending amendment is to prevent any money appropriated in this bill being used for the payment of the salary of the Ambassador to the Soviet Union, the nation which we all know is more commonly described as Communist Russia. The chairman of the subcommittee has suggested that this is not the proper place to consider this question. He let out his argument in response to a question from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. This is the proper place. We have the responsibility of appropriating money. True, the question of diplomatic relationship in itself rests with the executive branch of the Government, but under the Constitution we have the power of expressing our own views as a body when appropriation bills are under consideration. In rare cases, such as in the case of the Soviet Union, we are justified in exercising our constitutional power.

The argument that this is not the place for this question to be discussed certainly is irrelevant if advanced from a constitutional angle, because the framers of the Constitution left it with Congress to appropriate money. If Congress has the power to appropriate money, Congress has the power not to appropriate money for any particular purpose.

What are the circumstances which prompted me? In 1933 the Soviet Union was recognized in a semidiplomatic manner, as a result of the so-called Litvinov agreement. In this agreement the Soviet Union as a government gave its express and solemn promise to the Government of the United States and to our people that they would not permit "the formation or residence on the territory of the Soviet Union of any organization or group, and that they would prevent the activity on that territory of any organization or group or any representatives or officials of any organization or group which has as an aim the overthrow or preparation for overthrow or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories, or possessions."

This is a promise made by the Soviet Union to our Government. This promise was broken within 1 month after it was made. This promise has been repeatedly broken ever since it was made. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who was chairman of the special committee that investigated subversive activities, brought out evidence of a direct connection between the American section of the Communist Party and the Third International and the Communist Party of Russia, which is the backbone of that Government, and found that Russia was injecting itself directly into the internal affairs of the United States by furnishing money and contributing in every way possible to that which they hope for, the ultimate overthrow of our Government. The committee of which I was chairman uncovered the same type of evidence of the activity directly in our country of the Third International and the Soviet Government, collaborating with the American section of the Communist Party in their effort to obtain their ultimate objective, of the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is it not entirely within the power of the President to accomplish what the gentleman desires and what most of us desire?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will remember my views—and I speak my own views and I criticize no one, and

when I have fixed views I have the courage to attempt to express them and to carry them into operation—I called several months ago for the recall of the American Ambassador when an official of the Russian Government undertook to affect public opinion in the United States on a domestic question. I would not care how it was done, even though he might have made a speech with reference to a domestic matter along lines with which I might have agreed, a soviet official has no right to do that, or the official of any other government.

To give the gentleman a direct answer, yes; but we do not want any political aspects to the consideration of this question today if we can avert it. Let us look at it from our own angle as Members of Congress, determined to do our duty as we see it, whether or not we are going to vote an appropriation to maintain an American Ambassador to the Soviet Union, when we know, and every American knows, that the Soviet Union has repeatedly breached its solemn obligation, and when every American knows that the Soviet Union is doing everything within its power to overthrow established government not only here but throughout the entire world.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Could we not make provision to export the present Communist Soviet Ambassador, who is now in the Nation's Capital, at the same time as we do this?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am trying to address the Committee from the angle that I think is most appropriate on this occasion. I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin can adequately answer that question. I am sure, also, that if this amendment is adopted, the Soviet Ambassador to the United States will probably be called back to Moscow.

There is a very compelling reason behind my offering this amendment. The Fish committee, the McCormack committee, the Dies committee uncovered evidence warranting it. Within the last year our Government has made protests on a number of occasions to the Soviet Union because of their breaching not only this solemn obligation but other rights possessed by citizens of the United States under international law, and they have all been pigeon-holed. We saw the spectacle the other day when The Assistant Secretary of War made a speech, as he had a right to, and referred to the people of Russia as serfs—and such a reference can be found in history; it is not necessarily an adverse characterization; history records it—we witnessed the Soviet Ambassador going down to the State Department to enter a protest against that mild characterization.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I understood the gentleman to say that the recommendations of the several committees which have made investigations were pigeonholed.

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. KERR. That is what the gentleman said.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; if I did say it, I am glad the gentleman has corrected me. I referred to the protests of the American Government to the Soviet Union.

Mr. KERR. I wanted to find out, if I could, who pigeonholed these reports. The gentleman says he did not say they were pigeonholed?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said the protests of our Government to the Soviet Union have been pigeonholed.

Mr. KERR. I may have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am pleased to have any misunderstanding removed.

Mr. KERR. I understood the gentleman to say that these reports had all been pigeonholed.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I said that the Fish committee, the McCormack committee, and the Dies committee have shown by incontrovertible, sworn evidence that the Soviet Union and the Third International and the Communist Party

of Russia have violated a solemn obligation made by the Soviet Government to our Government.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope the gentleman has observed in the press that the United States district attorney at Detroit just recently has uncovered and produced evidence to the grand jury which has resulted in the indictment of those operating directly with funds furnished by the Soviet Union and its organization to enlist men, in violation of our law, to go over and fight in Spain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. KEEFE. And those people have been indicted because of such an absolute and flagrant violation of our law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Furthermore, three were indicted in the District of Columbia for violation of the Foreign Propaganda Registration Act, which my special committee recommended and I had the honor and pleasure of drafting and filing. There is no question about the violation. The only question is whether or not we have the courage to carry out not only our own personal feelings but the feelings of the American people by failing to appropriate this money. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the amendments offered here, the one under discussion now and the two additional ones, are the result, in a measure, of a resolution that I introduced in the House, which was practically the first one entered on the House calendars at the beginning of this session. This resolution provided for the same things which these amendments provide.

The only way to strike at Russian recognition is through this appropriation bill. In the first place, recognition of Russia was had without any congressional action; without any support by the Senate; without any ordinary movement of any of the operating forces which had been in opposition to such recognition; in fact, there was not and never has been used the words "recognition of Russia" in the document, and the only thing that showed that we had recognized Russia was the placing of an Ambassador in Moscow. Not only did we not recognize Russia in the ordinary way, but we did it through a series of letters between the President of the United States and Commissar Litvinov. He had hardly gone away from the National Capital, after discussing these things with the President and making promises, when he began to violate them. Up until the establishment of an Embassy of Russia in the United States, the Amtorg, a supposedly commercial organization, was the one which operated for Russia.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Can the gentleman conceive of any reason why the administration should recognize Russia without the consent of the Congress?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes; I can. I think it was thought at the time—I do not contend that I am a mind reader—there was a great deal of controversy over whether we should recognize the Soviet or not, and, while the President has the power, yet the ordinary procedure with respect to a matter of that importance would be to have the Senate first pass upon it. But the President just did it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Following the thought of the gentleman, may I suggest that perhaps the reason for recognition, although not valid in the gentleman's own mind, was that Litvinov, acting for Russia and the Soviet Government of that country, gave certain promises to those who handled the United States negotiations. The gentleman is aware also that any promises which were made have been broken.

Mr. BOLLES. Not only that, but among some of the other promises was one to meet some of the debts that

Russia owed or an acknowledgment of the debt, and, also, that we should have no further subversive action here. This has been shown by the McCormack committee and the others, yet the Amtorg was the salesman for the Soviet Government in the United States and through it, and through that commercial organization it was stimulating the subversive organizations here from Boardman, in Michigan, to other places through the support of divers and sundry newspapers and various pieces of literature, the distribution of which literature was paid for from the funds of the Amtorg—the Russian organization in America.

When we established an embassy, the Amtorg was dismissed, but, so far as the subversive movements are concerned, they continued. Where were the headquarters established for the Communist Government of Russia in the United States? When they put an embassy here in Washington, was it rushed from the Amtorg to Washington? I would like to know.

I am for this amendment. It is a part of what I had in mind when I introduced my resolution, and we might just as well fight it out right here.

If we want to do something for Finland, we do not have to ship them arms. We can tell the Finnish people, for whom we have sympathy, that we are not in sympathy with the people who are fighting them and murdering them. We can do it emphatically by adopting this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I heard a remark here today that this is not the place to consider striking out the item with reference to the maintenance of our embassy and thus severing our diplomatic relationship with Russia. I say that this is the place and a most opportune time. I am one who invariably opposes the Appropriations Committee legislating on matters of policy, but the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering the work of any committee is the superbody that has a right to pass on or change and amend anything and insofar as I am concerned, if I can cripple communism by that method I am going to do it here and now. [Applause.] There is no such thing as a partisan taint or color in the consideration of this matter and I am looking to my colleagues on both sides of the House to take this, the first opportunity, to speak out in unmistakable terms, and in such a way that the fiendish Molotovs and the scoundrelly murderous Stalins will know and remember the American attitude. I will not pay much attention as to the method employed when the objective is the all important thing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the gentleman believes also, I think, that the United States should stop buying gold from Russia at twice its actual cost.

Mr. DINGELL. I am in favor of doing anything to cripple the communism of Russia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that that money, which we give to Russia for the purchase of gold is used to buy armament with which to fight Finland.

Mr. DINGELL. I would cut off the benefit, if any, right under the ears, and not give a dime to Russian communism under any circumstances. I think the sooner we do that the better off we will be. The Soviet Government, after receiving recognition by the United States, proceeded to violate every assurance given to the Government of the United States. There is not a single, solitary shred of evidence anywhere I know of to show that they have ever fulfilled their end of the agreement or that they intended in the future to proceed in the manner that would inspire American confidence. There was an attempt to gain a profitable

objective and then to proceed in the usual way to undermine the Government of the United States. I think that the temper of the House is such as to show the world what we think of the Soviet cause, the Soviet system, and the Soviet relationship. I think moreover that the membership at this time is ready to strangle the monster.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Assuming the converse of this, will the gentleman support a motion to take care of Finland by making them a loan with which they may protect their women and children?

Mr. DINGELL. I think my attitude as regards Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, as well as toward martyred Poland, is well known. I will do anything for them—not only sell them rifles at a dollar apiece, but supply at cost all the ammunition and buckshot they can burn. Yes, I am willing to donate the first Garand rifle for the immediate benefit of Finland and later to do the same for Poland.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. A few days ago an argument was advanced on this floor that we should not close the American Embassy in Russia because there were certain so-called facts that we wanted to know. Does the gentleman think that is a valid reason?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not think the argument holds water at all. We are not interested in anything that exists in Soviet Russia today.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I want to express my approval in general of the remarks that the gentleman has made both as to our breaking off diplomatic relations with Russia and also aid to Finland. He has very nearly expressed my thought, and I believe the thought of the American people. Perhaps we ought to do this in another way—but we ought to do it. This is the first time we have yet had a chance to express our sentiments.

Mr. DINGELL. I think the sentiments expressed here on both sides by Members are generally the opinions and feelings of a great majority of the membership of this House, which reflect the attitude of our people. All references and provisions having to do directly or indirectly with anything that concerns Soviet Russia in this bill should be stricken out and there should be no argument on the point at all.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to read from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 469, in a speech made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], wherein he said that not a dollar of gold was bought from England or any other nation, not an ounce bought simply to acquire gold, that it was only done in ordinary business transactions. I do that because that is a very remarkable statement.

Mr. DINGELL. If my attitude in the matter is what is being considered, I would say to the gentleman that I would not buy a penny's worth of gold from Soviet Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. This is one of the most important issues with which we will be confronted. We cannot get the full membership of the House here except in one way, and that is by moving that the Committee rise and then making the point of no quorum. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members are present, a

quorum. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, no one has questioned the right of the President of the United States to recognize Soviet Russia. It is true he recognized Soviet Russia against the request of the American Federation of Labor, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the church elements, and most every other fraternal and patriotic group in the United States. Certain definite promises were made at that time by Commissar Litvinov prior to recognition. Practically none of those promises have been fulfilled. Practically every one of them has been repudiated, and so it is perfectly right and fair that the Members of this House should refuse appropriations and stop providing funds to continue an American Embassy at Moscow. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that this may be one of the most important issues before the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I am in agreement with the amendment. What I wanted to do was to get the Members here.

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman is right. I regret that the full membership of the House is not present. This is a great issue, and the main question is whether the House has the courage to face the issue or whether we will just pussyfoot and shadow-box and say we are powerless; that the great legislative body that controls appropriations is impotent; that we have no rights in this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We have information that at least a part of the compensation that has been paid by this Government to disabled veterans now living in Russia has been confiscated by the Russian Government and used for propaganda to help overthrow this Government. I am for putting a stop to it now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, my appeal here is on non-partisan grounds. I want the Members of the House, whether Republicans or Democrats, to have the courage to vote their own views, their own conscience, their own sentiments, and their own convictions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman spoke about the House having courage.

Mr. FISH. That is right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think that the House, in expressing that courage by a favorable vote on this amendment, would be reflecting the true sentiment of the overwhelming population of this country.

Mr. FISH. That is the very reason I raise that issue, because we are sent here by the people, elected by the people to carry out their wishes, and I believe that 90 percent of the people today are in favor of severing all diplomatic relations with that godless and despotic nation, Soviet Russia. The only question is whether we will be talked out of it; whether we will be told we are going beyond our powers, and are scared out of doing by our vote what we want to do—sever diplomatic relations with Communist Russia.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I was opposed to the recognition of Russia when it was done. I am opposed to it now, and I expect to vote for the elimination of this appropriation.

Mr. FISH. Good for you.

Mr. MAY. But the question I am raising is this: If we do vote for the amendment and eliminate the Embassy in Moscow, may we not remove all sources of information that we might need?

Mr. FISH. Let me answer the gentleman. It has been said upon this floor that we should keep an Ambassador in Moscow to act as a spy. Is that the American way of doing business—to have our Ambassador over there to act in the

capacity of a spy? It is something we have never done before. We know that Soviet Russia is not a friendly nation; that it is an unfriendly nation. We know that they are spreading their Communist propaganda all the time through their agencies over here, and the time has come to stop it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the cutting off of the salary of the Ambassador have the effect of severing diplomatic relations?

Mr. FISH. No; but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] proposes, after the will of the House is expressed on this amendment, to follow it with two other amendments which will be completely effective in severing diplomatic relations.

Mr. CELLER. Why does not the gentleman's committee bring in a straightforward resolution severing diplomatic relations, rather than doing this through the back door?

Mr. FISH. Our committee has not even granted a hearing on numerous bills of similar character. This is the first opportunity the House has had to express itself on this issue. Only a few weeks ago Earl Browder of your city and my city was sent to jail. Why? For using forged passports to go over there to learn about communism and to bring back and spread revolutionary communism in the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, everyone wants to hurt Russia, but you are not going to do it this way. I will go along with the Members of the House if they want to cease diplomatic relations with Russia, but I would rather see something affirmatively done to stop the activities of Russia at the place they can best be stopped. Our frontier is the Karelian Isthmus today. There is no question about it. Through centuries Russia has endeavored to get to the Atlantic Ocean. She is not there yet. You can stop her at one place, and only one place, and that is at the Karelian Isthmus. It is 35 miles across. Three hundred and fifty thousand Finns can hold the line if they have the guns and the planes that they need to do the job.

Let us suppose that they cannot hold the line there. What will be the next step? The invasion of Sweden and then Norway. These countries cannot stand against the hordes of Russia. This means Russia comes to the Atlantic and she comes close to us. I have heard it expressed on all sides that we are going to help England or someone else if we help the Finns. We are helping ourselves, Mr. Chairman. It is bad enough to have the Japanese Navy in the Pacific without having a Russian Navy in the Atlantic. The natural result is going to be a two-fleet Navy for the United States; it has got to be. When Russia reaches the Atlantic our troubles begin.

If you think we can do some good by eliminating our listening post in Moscow, all right, let us throw it out, let us stop the appropriations for this embassy; but in so doing you are not going to hurt the feelings of the Russians and you are not going to stop them in the way you would like to see them stopped. I know that before the Committee on Foreign Relations there are lots of bills to aid Poland and Finland, and I am in sympathy with them. Under the Neutrality Act we cannot do much.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. EATON. What is the sense of sending powder puffs and carpet slippers over to Finland? What they need is guns to defend their women and children.

Mr. IZAC. That is absolutely right. Under the Neutrality Act the President has not yet said that a state of war exists. If we wanted to we might be able even to spare a few destroyers, a few submarines. We might even be able to send a thousand planes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Would it not be far more advantageous to send some of our American youths over there to help them withstand the assaults of the Russians? Would not that be more effective?

Mr. IZAC. No. The American people, and the gentleman himself, and I are unanimous in not wanting to permit American youth to attempt to determine the course of destiny on the European Continent. [Applause.] But if we are faced with this eventuality, does not the gentleman agree with me that the place to help stop this encroachment of the Bolshevik nation is the Karelian Isthmus?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. My primary interest is to stop the Russian Communists from plotting the overthrow of this Government in the United States. This is the first and only opportunity I have had to vote my views on this proposition.

Mr. IZAC. I wish it could be effective in that direction.

Mr. RANKIN. If American sentiment continues to rise and we continue to investigate and expose them it will be effective.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the gentleman from California see any conceivable way by which the adoption of this amendment will tend to decrease communistic activities in this country?

Mr. IZAC. I am forced to admit that I do not.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at the last session the House passed a bill making it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. That bill is now pending in the Senate. It seems to me much could be accomplished if we could urge the Senate to act favorably on that bill and act promptly.

Mr. IZAC. This amendment, however, will not accomplish that purpose. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi, wherein he inquired if the passage of this amendment would decrease communism in the United States. I fail to see how merely cutting out the salary of our Ambassador to Russia would have any effect whatsoever on communism in the United States. It may have the contrary effect of stirring up the Communists and making conditions far worse so that we might have a cure that is worse than the disease.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In just a moment.

We are paying the salary of Mr. Steinhardt. He is the Ambassador. His salary is \$17,500. Cutting out the salary of this official would not affect our relations with Russia, for Mr. Steinhardt is a wealthy man and would still continue as Ambassador. Cutting out this appropriation, however, would cause considerable embarrassment to the administration. Frankly, it would give great comfort to Stalin. At least with Steinhardt there, we have direct communication with events in Russia. We would otherwise get our information second-hand. Stalin would not mind that. He wants us misinformed, not properly informed.

I am willing to cut off relations with Russia in every conceivable way, but let us do it honestly, let us do it courageously, let us do it in a straightforward manner. Let the Committee on Foreign Affairs bring in an appropriate resolution to that effect.

Since when do we in this Chamber, or in the cloakrooms, conduct the foreign affairs of this Nation? We have a Secretary of State in whom I, and I am sure you, repose

the greatest confidence, because he is, in truth and in fact, a great Secretary of State. And how ably and excellently is Mr. Hull assisted by his aides. I have naught but praise and admiration for the wise and self-sacrificing service of men like Under Secretary Welles, Counselor Moore, Assistant Secretaries Berle and Grady, and many others whose names for the moment escape me. Has Mr. Hull authorized anyone of us to bring forward an amendment of this character? No. He would frown upon such an amendment. He would ask you to vote against such an amendment, because you cannot carry on foreign affairs in this Chamber. We do not know all the facts, we are not conversant with all the factors. The State Department every day in their diplomatic pouches get thousands of communications of which we know nothing; and until and unless we know something of this diplomatic correspondence, those private communications, we dare not in this slipshod fashion, if I may use the word "slipshod" with reference to our diplomatic relations, attempt to sever relations with another country, directly or indirectly.

I loathe Russia, I despise Stalin, I spew at Molotov, I spit upon this man Litvinov; nevertheless, I shall vote against this amendment; I want things done in an orderly and straightforward manner. Let us do all we can in a decent straightforward manner to bring about the situation I might desire or the gentlemen from Mississippi or Massachusetts might desire. Let the Foreign Affairs Committee bring an appropriate resolution. But neither of these men have, I wager, appeared before that committee.

Does the President know about this amendment? Emphatically, no. Does Secretary Hull know about it? Again, no. How ridiculous then to carry on diplomatic relations in such an emotionally forensic manner, without even the knowledge of the President or Secretary Hull.

If such a motion as the gentleman from Massachusetts presents could prevail, then what would be the use of a State Department? Let the Appropriations Committee carry on our foreign affairs.

I repeat, let us sever diplomatic relations in a decent, straightforward manner—not in this haphazard, unusual, unthinkable manner.

I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York has said that this might stir up the Communists in this country. As Cicero said of Catiline, the greatest victory we can win over them is to drive them from secret treachery to open warfare. When they get ready to rise up, the people of this country will be ready for them.

Mr. CELLER. I cannot see how in the thunder the passage of this amendment will do what the gentleman from Mississippi states it will do. It can have no such effect and I believe it will have quite the contrary effect.

If you want to do something to strike at Russia and communism, help the Finns. I had this to say the other day and I am going to repeat it:

Finland must have ammunition and implements of war to fight her battle, and even our battle, against the Communists. She asks for planes and we give her cookies. She asks for guns and we give her cake. Shall we sit in the bleachers and watch her being slaughtered in the arena of bloody Stalinism?

Let us give this aid honestly, courageously, and fearlessly to Finland and then we will be striking at Russia in a logical manner and in a way that Russia does not want.

WHY BEAT ABOUT THE BUSH? LET FINLAND HAVE LOANS FOR ARMS

Finland must have ammunition and implements of war to fight her battle—and even our battle—against the Communists. She asks for planes, we offer her cookies. She asks for guns, we offer her cake. To vary the simile, shall we sit in the bleachers and watch her being slaughtered in the arena of bloody Stalinism?

My understanding is that when the settlement was made with Finland, the amount funded was \$9,000,000, which was set up on a 62-year amortization plan, with interest at 3 percent for the first 10 years and 3½ percent thereafter.

Prior to the funding agreements Finland paid interest in the amount of \$309,315.27, and subsequent thereto she paid interest of \$4,624,443.27, a total of \$4,933,758.54. She has also made principal payments of \$957,511.23, so that payments of principal and of interest, both prior and subsequent to the funding agreements, aggregate \$5,891,291.77.

The balance of Finland's indebtedness is \$8,042,466.77 principal and \$100,423.44 accrued interest.

If we eliminate interest, Finland has paid over \$8,000,000 on a debt of \$9,000,000—practically eight-ninths of her debt to us.

She fights Soviet Russia, which owes our Government approximately \$187,730,000 and which owes our citizens approximately \$225,000,000.

Think of this—Finland has paid and retired bonds held by our citizens during the past 8 years in the sum of about \$80,000,000. If she had followed the example of Russia and other nations and refused to pay, she would have accumulated \$8,000,000 paid into our Treasury and \$80,000,000 paid to bondholders, or a total of \$88,000,000. If she had held those \$88,000,000, she would not need our loans. She could now purchase with such sum all the arms and planes she needs. She paid. Others reneged. She is entitled to special treatment.

Under the proposed arrangement, which has the White House approval, a loan of \$20,000,000 might be made by the Export-Import Bank, whose capital would be arranged for that purpose. The loan, however, would be made on the condition that the purchase in this country would not include airplanes, arms, and munitions. Under such an arrangement, what is to prevent Finland from taking the American food that she can buy with the money loaned to her and exchanging the same with other nations for such military supplies?

But why put such temptation up to innocent Finland? Where is the consistency so far as our policy toward Finland is concerned? It has been the well-recognized and well-merited rule of the State Department to refuse to recognize any territorial changes brought about by force. For that reason, we refuse to recognize the capture of Manchukuo in China by Japan; we refused to recognize Bohemia and Moravia, which were stolen from Czechoslovakia by Germany. For the same reason we could not recognize any exploitation of Finland by Russia. Why should we not help Finland against the bandit Stalin? We make speeches concerning the sanctity of treaties and international law. We have a Kellogg Treaty, to which scores of nations have been signatories, whereby we exacted the solemn pledge that they would not resort to war as an instrument of national policy. Russia has violated the letter and spirit of that treaty. She seeks to possess Finland by force. She has ditched international law. Shall we encourage her butchery by refusing aid to her victim? Shall we remain stupidly silent in the face of rapine and plunder?

Nay, more, we have sent to aggressor Japan, in her pillaging of China without let or hindrance, scrap iron, copper, lead, and all kinds of military supplies. If we can supply 85 percent of the military import needs of Japan, including planes, equipment, and American bombs to slaughter Chinese women and children, assuredly there should be a way to help the gallant Finns fight the cause of human liberty and prevent ruthless slaughter of innocents. The Finns badly need pursuit planes to fight off Russian bombers. We should help supply them.

We have loaned money to China to the extent of \$25,000,000. China is in no way one whit different from Finland, because we have refused to apply the Neutrality Act in the fracas between China and Japan.

In my humble estimation, we subscribe to international anarchy if we do not help poor and helpless Finland—and that help should mean "help." The only help worth while is arms, airplanes, bullets, guns. Cakes and cookies and sandwiches will not do much good to Finland now. I would thumb my nose at some of the psalm-singing hypocrites who agitate against sending her military supplies. The Finns today, in their heroic stand against Stalin's Communist hordes,

rank with the Greeks at Marathon, Washington at Trenton, and the Texans at the Alamo.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment because I believe that if it would be adopted it would be a big step toward getting our country involved in European wars. I feel extremely sorry for the poor people in Finland, Russia, Germany, England, France, Poland, and every other country in the world. If the people in the warring countries had the opportunity to vote on a war referendum there would be no wars. It is the unprincipled demagogues in every country who are responsible for the wars that are going on today.

A great deal has been said about Russia trying to overthrow our Government. I have said many times that we would not have to live in fear of our Government being overthrown by Russia or by any other power if we Members of Congress will pass legislation to provide employment for the 9,000,000 people who are unemployed and take care of the 25,000,000 people who are in need of food, shelter, and clothing.

History shows that the nations which took care of its people were not undermined by outside powers. Countries have been undermined by its own people who were deprived of freedom of speech, freedom of assemblage, freedom of religious worship, and other fundamental principles to which all mankind is justly entitled. Let us not become involved in European conflicts. Our great country will be able to do more to bring about world peace by remaining neutral. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the interest that has been shown in this matter and the number of requests that have come to me, I ask unanimous consent that the time of debate on this amendment be extended 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, every Member on this floor knows what this amendment attempts to do. We do not have to sit here 20 minutes to get any further information. If we extend the time, it will only give those who are opposed to this amendment a chance to organize. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of debate on this amendment be extended 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we had an agreement for a half hour, which was agreeable to everybody.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS. By unanimous consent it was agreed that debate on this amendment would last 30 minutes. That time will be up in 3 minutes. That is not supersedable by another motion, only by another unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition for the purpose of speaking on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of this House who is better informed as to the machinery of it than the gentleman from Massachusetts. He knows that every year prior to the consideration of this bill in the House weeks are spent by the committee in considering all of these matters. He has had this same feeling about the Soviet Union for years. He knows and has known that the proper and orderly procedure is to come before the committee and present his case.

Temperamentally and impulsively I am inclined to agree with all the expressions that have been made with reference to the Soviet Union. It, and everything it stands for, is repellent to me. But let us not grow wild on this subject, wave a bloody flag, and get ourselves involved any deeper in the conflict that now exists than we are.

The President on December 1 made this statement:

The news of the Soviet naval and military bombings within Finnish territory has come as a profound shock to the Government and people of the United States. Despite efforts made to solve the dispute by peaceful methods to which no reasonable objection could be offered, one power has chosen to resort to force of arms. It is tragic to see the policy of force spreading, and to realize that wanton disregard for law is still on the march. All peace-loving peoples in those nations that are still hoping for the continuance of relations throughout the world on the basis of law and order will unanimously condemn this new resort to military force as the arbiter of international differences.

Let us keep our feet on the ground and use good, common, hard sense. Ask yourselves what single good purpose can be served by the approval of this amendment? When you have asked yourselves that question, you will come to the very definite conclusion that nothing will have been done other than to provoke a great nation of the world to further excess and to involve us further in diplomatic entanglements.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. No; I am sorry I cannot yield.

It is bad policy to establish the principle that the maintenance of diplomatic relations with another government implies approval of the form of government of that country or of the actions and policies of the government of that country. If that were the case, it would appear to be necessary to consider the advisability of discontinuing diplomatic relations with several other governments now pursuing policies and objectives which the Government and the people of the United States do not approve.

The argument is not sound. You are being swept off your feet by sentimentality. You are not being logical; you are not being careful in the handling of the major affairs of this Government. You cannot afford to legislate in such a way. I insist that you want to be careful, you want to be calm, and you do not want to do anything here today that will involve this country, but you take the responsibility for doing just that if you adopt this amendment and throw the red flag in the face of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of reasons why this amendment ought not to be adopted.

No other country has broken off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia during this recent tense period, and even the French and British Governments, although at war with Germany, have not withdrawn their diplomatic missions from Moscow.

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is to maintain peaceful relations with all countries. Certainly the breaking off of diplomatic relations with Russia would not be in conformity with our endeavor to maintain such peaceful relations. It is generally considered that when diplomatic relations between two governments have been severed the possibilities of dangerous and acrimonious controversy are increased through the absence of official representatives in the capitals of each country and the opportunity directly to discuss such questions as may arise between the two governments.

If diplomatic relations were broken off, in the case of Soviet Russia particularly, we would be at the mercy of propagandists and special pleaders for information with regard to that country and we would be unable to verify through our own official channels such information as might be put forward by those having special interests in the Russian situation.

Should the occasion arise for the President to be of assistance in furthering the aims of peace, it would be important to have diplomatic relations with Russia in order that his viewpoint might be accurately presented to the Soviet Government.

As far as concerns the question of communism, the severance of relations would not remove this problem from the

sphere of domestic activities in this country. It would probably drive such activities underground. The matter of dealing with communistic activities in this country is a problem of domestic concern and is at this time being well handled by the Government and local authorities, as has been shown by recent events.

Let me call your attention finally to one feature that has already been mentioned in the Committee of the Whole.

Diplomatic representatives are often more necessary and can do more during periods of tense relations with a foreign country and are often more useful and necessary in those periods than when the relationship with that particular country is easy and on a more amicable basis. During periods of tense relations, the presence of a diplomatic mission becomes essential for the protection of American citizens and property in the other country.

As long as we have officials in Russia we have eyes and ears there, and we have the means of being of some assistance to American nationals. When you take the Ambassador and your foreign officials away, you leave every American national in Russia at the mercy of Russia, and then we have no implement to assist them, we have no means of knowing what is going on over there, and we have no means of protecting our interests, and our interests in Russia are major. To sever relationships will simply damage us and cannot help us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DUNN) there were—ayes 88, noes 86.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. CALDWELL.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 9, on page 6.

Mr. Chairman, the vote just taken indicates that a large number of the Members of this House, nearly a majority, are in favor of severing diplomatic relations with Russia. While the vote was not taken on that specific issue, I am sure that if the Committee on Foreign Affairs would bring out a resolution and give us a direct opportunity to vote on the question there would be an overwhelming sentiment in this House for such action. [Applause.]

Some have said that no aid should be given to Finland because it might involve us with Russia. Just what aid are we now giving to Russia? We in the United States are making it possible for Russia to get \$35 an ounce for every ounce of gold that is produced in Russia at a cost of \$12 an ounce. We are taking Russia's supply of gold and are paying them a premium of tens of millions of dollars every year. Therefore, instead of making loans to Russia, we have given them outright gifts out of the United States Treasury and from the American people with which to buy war supplies and other materials to destroy our friends in Finland.

What more are we doing to help Russia? We are subsidizing the exports of our wheat and other agricultural commodities, and we are paying bonuses and subsidies to Russia so they may get wheat with which to feed their soldiers and supplement other necessary supplies.

Therefore, there is no reason in the world why we cannot aid Finland and help these courageous men and women in their fight for the preservation of the democracies of the world against the dictatorships. We should take action in this House to provide that friendly aid which will be of material assistance to them, rather than give aid and succor to the enemy. I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will bring out a resolution that will make possible the necessary aid to Finland.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOK. For the gentleman's information, I may say there is a bill before the Ways and Means Committee providing for the authorization of a loan to Finland and I wish the Ways and Means Committee would act on that bill now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Ways and Means Committee could, but someone has said here today that we cannot aid Finland on account of our neutrality law. Well, we are giving aid to Japan under our neutrality law and we are giving aid to Russia because Russia has not been declared unfriendly to the United States. But for some reason or other there has been a cooling off process among some of the administration leaders as to a loan for Finland. I hope that these leaders have not been intimidated by Russian representatives. It is our business to discontinue that unholy alliance we now have with Russia.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Neutrality Act is not involved, because that act has never been invoked with respect to the conflict between Russia and Finland.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; or as far as Japan is concerned; because we could stop the war in China within 60 days if we would stop the shipment of war supplies to Japan; but for some reason—maybe we are not in on the hidden secrets of the State Department—they take no action to help our friends in China, and now they are cooling off and about to take the same attitude toward that friendly country of Finland, after they have met their obligations to us and are one of the few surviving democracies of the world. We can give material aid to Finland without becoming involved in the European war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I have listened with great interest to the speeches that have been made here today in connection with the conduct of the Soviet Republic in world affairs. I heartily agree with the denunciation that has been uttered as to the actions of the Soviet in its relationship with other countries. I deplore the events that have resulted from Russia's repudiation of every promise and agreement.

In my opinion, it is equally important for us to discuss the happenings in our own country on the part of public officials which, in any way, may transgress upon the rights of our citizens. Recently, in the Federal court of the eastern district, 17 men were arraigned and each one was held in \$50,000 bail. Although these men were charged with a serious crime against the Government, bail in the amount of \$50,000 is certainly excessive. I do not believe there is any precedent for such exorbitant bail, especially in view of the excellent records of most of the arrested men. However, I am not personally concerned with this phase of the case because I do not know any of the individuals, nor do they live in my district. My interest in the matter arises out of the conduct of our Government officials after the arrest. I believe what then happened to these men was a definite violation of their constitutional rights as well as an occurrence which we would very loudly protest if it were permitted in a foreign country. I refer to the publication of their pictures in a recent issue of a weekly magazine in such a manner as to seriously reflect upon the men. This magazine published a complete front view and a side view of each arrested man and across the chest was an identification tag indicating that the picture was taken by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The release of these pictures, printed in a publication, evidently with the approval and consent of the Department of Justice, was grossly unfair to the arrested men and a practice which has no sanction either in law or in common decency.

My only purpose in discussing this matter today upon the floor of the House of Representatives is to direct the attention of the Congress to this situation, with the hope that the

practice of the Department of Justice in making available for publication in the press pictures of an arrested person will be stopped. Under our Constitution every man is considered innocent until proven guilty, and we should do everything possible to protect that right. I appreciate the attention and interest of the House in my talk, and I hope that as result of our action here today we shall see this vicious practice immediately discontinued. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words—"\$17,500 each."

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] did not prevail. I will agree it was not the proper procedure, but it was the only opportunity this House has had or is apt to have to express its will on the recognition of Soviet Russia. We cannot report out any bill from the Foreign Affairs Committee, because the administration dominates it and is against it, and it could not come before the House in any other way than it came just now. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will offer a motion to recommit, so that every Member of the House may have an opportunity on a roll-call vote to go on record whether he is in favor of severing diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. I do not think the gentleman meant to say that anybody dominates the rank and file of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FISH. No; I will change the word to "influence," if that will satisfy the gentleman, because, naturally, under any administration the Secretary of State has influence and should have influence with the majority on any committee, particularly Foreign Affairs, and I assume that would be so under a Republican administration. I know it has been, and I know it is likewise true under your administration.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. As one member of the majority party and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would welcome more frequent meetings of that committee in order to take up these important matters. I think it is a crying shame—

Mr. FISH. Oh, the gentleman knows that three or four bills have been introduced to sever diplomatic relations with Russia, and that we have not had a hearing on one of them.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. FISH. And I think the gentleman will find that the State Department is against such a hearing, and I think that he will find also that is the reason we have not had any hearings. The gentleman is a member of that committee, and is a member of the majority party, and he should try to have such a hearing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. On page 17 of the bill I will offer another amendment. There is no need of offering one on page 7 now in view of the action of the House just taken.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I wish the chairman of the subcommittee, and the minority ranking member of the committee would pay attention, and I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to also give his attention to these remarks. I do not know whether it is the intention of the committee to leave out Belgium. Belgium, as I understand it, has an ambassadorial status the same as 10 or 11 nations, and I think it should be included in this bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know what question the gentleman has asked me.

Mr. FISH. Oh, I see that Belgium is in a separate clause by itself, on lines 12 and 13.

Mr. RAYBURN. My reaction to this whole thing is that the House of Representatives is not the place to settle our diplomatic or foreign affairs when we have duly constituted authorities to do that very thing.

Mr. FISH. We have the power to do so, and I hope the House will always exercise that power.

Mr. RAYBURN. I hope the House will never do it in this way.

Mr. FISH. In its own judgment and wisdom after discussion on both sides of the proposal. I have moved to strike out the last two words, "\$17,500 each" for the purpose of asking why the American Ambassadors from England, from France, and from Belgium have been brought home. Can it be that they have been brought home just on the eve of the outbreak of the full fury of the European war to tell the American people that the British subjects and the French citizens and the Belgian citizens are in favor of a third term? So far all we know from those Ambassadors is that they have made public announcements in America that they are in favor of a third term because of the danger of swapping horses in the midst of a European war. If they are to earn their \$17,500, it seems to me that they ought to be at their post of duty in the midst of this war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. EATON. I rise to ask if the gentleman received an answer to his question as to why Belgium is left out of this list?

Mr. FISH. I find that it is taken care of in lines 12 and 13, but I have had no answer why our Ambassadors to London, Paris, and Brussels are here in America while being paid \$17,500 each to serve our country at their posts abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I rise to make a few observations that I hope will be given consideration. I do not suppose anybody in this House fails to appreciate how important, how delicate, and how dangerous is this subject that we propose to deal with right now. This is one of the major diplomatic matters that this Government will be called upon to deal with perhaps in many, many years. If there ever was a time when American statesmanship ought to have its feet on the ground and its head on its shoulders it is right now. Insofar as I am concerned, I do not know how it is with the body of the membership of this House; I never heard of this proposition to sever diplomatic relationship with Russia until about 15 or 20 minutes ago. Just think of the spectacle of the great American House of Representatives passing on a question of this sort all "het" up and with their eyes shining. When people's eyes are shining it is no time to pass on great questions. Think of the speeches that we have listened to, undertaking to stampede this House now, in this critical hour of our Nation's life. Let me make you one or two suggestions, and you just think about them. I do not know so much about what is in the books. I know something about what the books are written about. I have observed life. I have observed the operation of the laws of cause and effect. The adoption of this resolution could not hurt Russia. Its reasonable and probable result would be to help Russia. You are familiar with the history of the French Revolution. Outside opposition was the most solidifying influence exercised upon the French people. We are supposed to be opposed to bolshevism in America. I ask you, out of your own experience, what is the most solidifying influence that can be exercised on any people? It is outside opposition. We are giving to these dictators in Europe what those dictators could not possibly command—outside opposition, the most solidifying influence that can be exerted on a divided people. Take the history of the French Revolution. I do not think anybody can study the French Revolution and not know that the thing that drove the French back upon themselves in solidarity and made it possible for them to fight the battles of the Revolution and carry them through the Napoleonic wars, and almost enabled them to whip the world, was the

fact that as soon as they declared their Revolution, outside people began to attempt to influence the policy of France.

I do not think anybody can study the Russian revolution and fail to reach the conclusion that there was no force or influence within that country which could possibly have held together that divided people, of all races and religions and tongues, until they could have consolidated that revolution, except for the economic pressure which this country and other countries began immediately to bring to bear upon them. I am just talking common sense now. We are dealing with a practical matter.

I remember my grandfather told a story one time about a man going down the road and he saw a man and his wife fighting. He, the outsider, tried to intervene, and they turned on him and almost beat him to death. [Laughter.]

Do you want to know why we have got just one party in the South? Every time we show a disposition to split up, you Yankees threaten to do something to us, the cracks close up, and we have just one party. [Laughter.]

I am talking sense now. This is a practical proposition. If we want to help bolshevism, this is the way to do it, because we give their leaders all the excuse they will need for the failure of their policy. They say, "Look what those capitalistic nations are doing." They do not need any better excuse than that. All the excuse we have in the South is, "Look what those Yankees are trying to do to us," and we do not need any further argument. [Laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want you to think about this thing now. This is no small matter we are dealing with now. It does not fall within the group with reference to which partisan politics may be excused.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EATON. We all have the greatest affection and regard for the distinguished gentleman, but what is the logic of the position that the gentleman is now taking? It must be that the American people must draw themselves into a spiritual and intellectual vacuum and have nothing to say about what is going on in the rest of the world.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; it is not quite that. There is definite conflict between sentiment and judgment. When you get to a conflict between sentiment and judgment you are in a bad situation, and it is difficult to handle. I admit that sentiment is fine in its place, but whenever sentiment climbs up into the judgment seat and undertakes to determine policy, it is a mighty dangerous time for the people of the Nation. [Applause.] Sentiment performs a good office when it calls judgment to the judgment seat, but sentiment makes a bad mistake when it misunderstands its natural limitations and undertakes to speak the voice of judgment. Please think that over.

Mr. EATON. I would like to answer that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I will not let the gentleman answer that. I do not want the gentleman to spoil that good statement of mine.

I doubt that Hitler could have consolidated the revolution in Germany but for the solidifying help from outside opposition. That made it impossible for the opposition to him in Germany to do anything about it, speaking practically. In my view—and I mean no offense—this proceeding is the sort which cannot add anything to our diplomatic strength and certainly nothing to the confidence of the Nation in the fitness of the House of Representatives to guide and guard the interest of the Nation in this, one of the most tragic, dangerous periods in all the annals of time. It is a pitiable, pathetic thing. What do we propose to do? We propose to cut off the pay of a fellow we have got hired over there in Russia and think that is going to have something to do with the war. Now, Members of this House, do not do it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that cutting out the appropriation for our embassy to Russia at this time would be a round-about, indirect manner of accomplishing what a great many people of the United States would like to have done. This is to give some substantial assistance to that heroic nation on the other side of the world—Finland—which has aroused the admiration of the entire American people by its splendid fight to maintain its national integrity against the onslaught of one of the most colossal nations of the world. Russia is attempting to invade Finland and subject it to its own desires in order to secure a base whereby they can disseminate their political propaganda throughout the world more easily.

I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. Izac], when he stated that our frontier is on the Karelian Isthmus. It most certainly is and the sooner we recognize this fact the better. The war which is going on in Finland today is only a part of a general campaign which has been carried on by Soviet Russia to spread its political ideology all over the world. They have attempted to spread it in this Nation by every other means, except the force of arms. They are attempting to spread it in Finland by force of arms. If we are going to lend any assistance to this nation in its hour of need, this assistance must not only be timely, but it must also be substantial. All the statements that have been made that the neutrality act now on our books bars us from lending any assistance to Finland, are entirely erroneous. There is nothing in the neutrality act which would bar us from lending assistance to Finland. War has not been declared and the Russians themselves have announced that they are not waging war in Finland. They are merely going into Finland to the assistance of the People's Party. They, by their own admission, are not waging war. They are only engaged in a neighborly act of kindness. They have also announced to the League of Nations that they are going into Finland in order to prevent England and France from seizing a base in that territory. They have announced to their own people that they are engaged in defending Russia from Finnish invasion.

Now I submit to you that the situation in that part of the globe today is exactly this. Russia is going into Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. The Bear has his eyes fastened on that territory today as he has had for centuries. So if Norway, Sweden, and Denmark do not join Finland to beat Russia, they will be defeated in detail, and the only way they can effectively combat the threat of Russian invasion is to actually invade Russia. In no other way can the Scandinavian nations win the war. As soon as the weather becomes milder, the Russians can and will bomb every city, town, and village in Finland and reduce it to ruins. They will bring up the necessary heavy artillery tanks and transportation and force their way into Finland to actually occupy the territory and force the Finns into subjection. The small force of the Finns will fall from sheer exhaustion. Then the Russian hordes will sweep across the Scandinavian peninsula and also Denmark.

In order to win, the threatened nations must invade Russia and destroy the bases from which the bombing planes and armies are operating. This must be done either by land or air or by a combination of the two. Wars are not won by defensive operations. Effective combat of bombing planes can only be accomplished by operating against the bases from which they are serviced. If we are to furnish assistance to Finland, it must be substantial enough to enable them and those who must be their allies to wage the war as it must be waged to win. Any assistance short of this would be a mere gesture of friendship, foolish and futile. They too must understand that they cannot win unless they invade Russia and destroy the will of the Russians to wage war. This is not at all impossible because of the internal condition of Russia as regards transportation facilities and general morale.

I call the attention of the membership here this afternoon to the fact that we are not nearly so far away from this

conflict as we might seem to be. Iceland is only a few hundred miles from that place, and Iceland is only a few hundred miles from North America. It is a direct link in the chain, and Russia has her eyes fastened on it.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Is there not a better way of doing what the gentleman and all America wants to do? That is to give the Finns all they need. Then they will take care of themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. FADDIS. That is exactly what I am trying to propose here this afternoon, that we adopt a common-sense practical way of assisting the Finns by giving them what they need to maintain their independence. By so doing we are also helping ourselves. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I want it distinctly understood that my attitude on this proposition is not prompted by any European war. I am looking at it from an American standpoint. I am opposed to any government that attempts to overthrow the Government of the United States, and I am for driving from American shores every influence that comes here and attempts to destroy my Government. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] overlooked one fact: Geographically, Russia is closer to us than any other European country, for she lies just across Bering Strait from Alaska.

Let me answer the distinguished gentleman from Texas. In the course of his remarks he spoke about the world's turning against France after communism had brought on the French Revolution, and about forcing the French to solidarity. What I am trying to do today is to bring some solidarity among the American people to fight communism and drive it out of this country. He talks about what they did to Germany. I will tell you what happened to Germany. The Communists flooded in there by the thousands, took control of Germany, destroyed the German Republic, and created Hitler. Do you want them to create a Hitler here? We are going to have to stop these communistic influences in the United States, and this is the only opportunity that I have had to vote to that effect.

I heard witnesses before the Dies committee. I heard a Negro testify that he had been sent to Russia and trained in the technique of revolution of waging war against the white people of the United States for the purpose of overthrowing this Government and waging war on the white people of the South. They have taken young white people, as well as Negroes, to Russia and trained them for that purpose in flagrant violation of the treaty by which we recognized the Soviet Union.

I am looking at this matter from an American standpoint, not from a Finnish standpoint, not from a German standpoint, not from an English standpoint, but from the standpoint of my own Government created by Washington, defended by Jackson, perpetuated by your people and mine; and I shall cast my vote at every opportunity presented on the floor of this House to drive these iniquitous influences from American soil. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that all of us here are speaking for America. Our opinions differ, but we are for America, and we ought not, any of us, to doubt the stand of any other Member of this body or of the American people on that subject. There is now pending a motion to recall the American Ambassador from Russia.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] set out the fundamentals of the history that all of us ought to know and observe under present conditions. It seems to me that if we only look closely and carefully at what is taking place in Europe we can defend and promulgate our Americanism to the very best possible advantage by recognizing our duty

to the little Republic of Finland by supplying them with the things they need with which to defend themselves. Any man who knows the border between Russia and Finland will tell you that if they are supplied with arms, ammunition, and airplanes, which they have a perfect right to have from us under our Neutrality Law, they can defend that border until Russia will be thoroughly sick of the war that they are forcing upon that little nation, 40 Russians to 1 Finlander. It is a shameless scene, one that shocks every man with a drop of sporting blood in his veins and people all over the world. If those countries that we call civilized support the Finns only so far as to provide them with arms and munitions, Russia will break to pieces over this merciless, this brutal attack. That part of Russian ideology that ought to be eliminated from the world will be eliminated when the Russian people awaken to what the Stalin government is doing to Finland. Finland is giving to the world the best example of courage and manhood that has been seen in a hundred years. The people of America are abundantly able and abundantly willing to give to this people what they have got to have to defend themselves.

There is no danger in our being drawn into the war in doing this. Russia has not only not declared war on Finland, but denies that she is making war on Finland. There is nothing in our own neutrality law, under these circumstances, that at all limits our right to lend money or sell war equipment of all kinds to Finland. No reasoning American will deny these are our rights, and none but a "Mr. Milque-toast patriot" would fear to act on those rights.

That will do the thing we are all driving at.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman know if the Secretary of State or the President is making any effort to get Russia to lay off of Finland?

Mr. KELLER. I do not know about that because I have not talked to them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman think they should do something about it?

Mr. KELLER. I think everything has been done that can be done and I think everything will continue to be done that it is possible to do. However, there is this delay which we have in our own body and in another body. We are talking a republic to death while a brave people are begging only for arms and equipment with which to defend their country and their lives.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If they have done everything they could do, they have not done anything.

Mr. KELLER. They may not be able to do anything.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The administration is delaying action in the House.

Mr. KELLER. In relation to Finland?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. So far as helping Finland is concerned?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. I have not heard that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman heard the President's message the other day?

Mr. KELLER. I did; but I did not get that from it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what it said.

Mr. KELLER. That is not my opinion of what it said.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman feels that Russia is the aggressor in this matter?

Mr. KELLER. There is no question about that.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact, as reported in the press of a couple of days ago, that a thousand young people met in New York City to choose delegates to the American Youth Congress and passed a resolution condemning Finland for being the aggressor and accusing it of starting this war upon Soviet Russia?

Mr. KELLER. I regret to admit that there are likely even more than a thousand young jackasses loose in New York. I am glad the gentleman does not belong to them

nor endorses what they are doing when they do things like that. I am as much for helping Finland as any man can be, and I am as much for giving them their chance to show up the shortcomings of Russia as any other man. Let us give them the money and give them airplanes. I repeat, we are under no obligation to withhold aid from Finland. There is no war. There is nothing in the neutrality law which will limit our Government so far as Finland is concerned. We should rise up and take action at the present time to give that little republic exactly what it needs. It will do the rest. You need not worry about that; it is not fighting its battles alone. Every man in those Scandinavian countries is on his tiptoes ready to help. In the next few weeks more than 50,000 men from Scandinavian countries, who know that climate, and are as good soldiers as there are in the world, will be helping Finland. We should give them ammunition and the equipment that men take with them into the defenses of that kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a speech at this point, but we have spent considerable time on this particular section, and there will be ample opportunity for debate as the bill is read. I am wondering if we cannot read the bill for a short while, then have the debate continue? We are anxious to finish up this bill tonight, if possible; however, I have no desire to shut off anyone who has a speech to make, but I thought these speeches might be made a little later.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one other question of the gentleman from Illinois in order to follow through the thought that was expressed in the first question I put to him. It was reliably reported in the press that a group of about 1,000 young people met in New York to choose delegates to the American Youth Congress, which is meeting here in Washington. It was further reported that of this group only 5 voted against a series of resolutions which condemned Finland and gave support to Soviet Russia, thus very clearly demonstrating their interest and affection for the Soviet Government of Russia.

Mr. Chairman, the delegates from that meeting came to the meeting of the American Youth Congress; and appearing in the press this morning is this statement, headed:

MRS. ROOSEVELT DEFENDS COMMUNIST RIGHTS IN GROUP

A White House debate, in which Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt defended inclusion of Communists in the American Youth Congress, was divulged yesterday on Capitol Hill.

Then follows the report of that meeting held at the White House, to which numerous Members of Congress were invited, and which they apparently attended, because Senator JOSH LEE is quoted in this article as being in absolute opposition to their arguments. Senator WHEELER, of Montana, is also quoted similarly as disagreeing with "Mme. President." The Senator, who is frequently mentioned as a possible Presidential candidate, said this:

Where will you get with conservatives if we liberals are opposed to you?

There is the picture. These people came down here from New York after attending a meeting such as I have described and are invited to attend a meeting at the White House where the rights of these young Communists are applauded as being part and parcel, and rightfully part and parcel, of the American Youth Congress. I want the spokesmen for the White House to know that so far as I am concerned I oppose vigorously, as did the representatives of this body and the Senate who attended that meeting, the inclusion of the Young Communists League as representative of the American youth of this Nation. When that matter comes before the House at a future time, I assure you I am going to present the result of a very long investigation on that subject.

I am in favor of the principles of the N. Y. A., but I want it sent out to the country today that there should not be any connection between the N. Y. A. and the American Youth

Congress. Those who are purporting to speak as representatives of the American Youth Congress in support of the N. Y. A. had better keep their mouths closed, because they are serving to discredit that organization and its splendid work rather than doing it any good.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman read the resolution to which he referred as having been passed in New York?

Mr. KEEFE. No; I do not have that resolution here. Everybody here saw it in the press. It was published in the papers. I will get it and put it in the Record if the gentleman wants it.

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I should be very glad to have the gentleman do that. I should also like to make this remark—that if it misrepresents the sense of that meeting, as this newspaper article does the sense of the meeting at the White House, it does not carry very much weight.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no knowledge that the newspaper article misrepresents the sense of the meeting at the White House.

Mr. KELLER. It does.

Mr. KEEFE. I am informed that the press were barred from this meeting at the White House, and that what appeared in the press this morning was given to the press by those who attended as members of this conference.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to paraphrase a little the remark of the gentleman from Illinois—and I think he will agree with me and say that jackasses are welcome as members of this Youth Congress.

Mr. KELLER. I said that the gentleman was not guilty of being one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to restrict unnecessarily the latitude of debate, but we are going to try to finish this bill today, and we should like to move along. I suggest that we read several sections before we have any further debate under pro forma amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no salary herein appropriated shall be paid to any official receiving any other salary from the United States Government.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound an inquiry to the members of the committee which has reported this bill. It seems that members of the committee in charge of the bill opposed the McCormack amendment on the ground that we should not recall our Ambassador from the Communist Soviet Union because we should retain him as our listening post in Moscow. What I want to find out is why this bill, as reported out, includes an annual appropriation of \$17,500 for an Ambassador to the Government of Germany, notwithstanding the fact that the New Deal administration for many months has not seen fit to have an Ambassador in Berlin, Germany. I cannot understand why the New Deal administration finds it necessary to have an Ambassador in Communist Russia and unnecessary to have one in Germany.

Mr. CALDWELL. I may say to the gentleman that that is an administrative matter over which this committee has no control.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This clearly indicates that the argument advanced in opposition to the McCormack amendment was not based on a sound principle. If it is necessary to maintain an Ambassador in the Communist Soviet Union in a listening-post capacity, it surely is just as essential to maintain an Ambassador in Germany for the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard many eloquent talks today in favor of taking sides in foreign wars and furnishing sinews of war to one side at the expense of the almost bankrupt Treasury of the United States. We now have a national

debt of more than \$42,000,000,000. Our Federal Government for many years has been running several billion dollars in the "red" each year. In addition to our stupendous national debt of more than \$42,000,000,000, we have about seven or eight billion dollars of obligations which have been guaranteed by our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury.

With more than 11,000,000 American people out of employment and our Government, in the name of economy, reducing expenditures for feeding our hungry unemployed Americans and reducing the expenditures for the relief of our distressed American farmers, it is absolutely un-American and indefensible to continue to play Santa Claus to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars for people in foreign lands. Are we going to our American people and point out that in the name of economy we reduced W. P. A. appropriations, we reduced essential appropriations for the relief of our distressed farmers and other distressed American citizens, in order to balance the Budget and be in a position to play Santa Claus in a big way and hand foreign nations many millions of dollars to carry on their wars? As sure as night follows day, as soon as we take sides and finance foreign wars it will not be long before American youth will again be slaughtered on foreign battlefields under the wave of propaganda which is now sweeping America as it did prior to our entering the last World War.

With reference to aid for Finland, if these multimillionaire newspaper owners—such as the owners of the Washington Star, Kaufman and Noyes, who have been demanding that we raid our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury to finance wars of foreign nations—are sincerely in favor of helping those foreign countries, why do they not raise a private fund and contribute a million dollars each and call upon their fellow multimillionaire propagandists who feel as they do to do likewise? They should then go to multimillionaire new dealers—who are as liberal with the American taxpayers' money as they are—and solicit a contribution of a million dollars from each of the hundred or more multimillionaire new dealers who are the main cogs of the New Deal political machine which plays Santa Claus to foreign countries in a big way, as the Democrats always do when they are in power. Let them go to Doris Duke and Jimmie Cromwell, who contributed \$50,000 in order that he might be appointed Minister to Canada. Go to Barney Baruch, the multimillionaire New Deal unofficial president; go to President Roosevelt, Mr. Morgenthau, Mr. Edison, Harold Ickes, and the other 125 multimillionaire New Deal liberals, who are very liberal when it comes to spending other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Congress will serve America. We are Members of the American Congress. Let us devote our best efforts and energies to the welfare of our own country and our countrymen. Let us keep out of foreign entanglements and stop playing Santa Claus in a big way to those in foreign lands, and stop financing their wars, particularly since our Federal Treasury is almost bankrupt. Furnishing dollars and other sinews of war to a nation engaged in war is not neutral. It is an act of war which will result in again sending our men to slaughter on foreign battlefields. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on November 30, 1939, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States and also to the Secretary of State, requesting that the United States break off diplomatic relations with Russia in the best interests of the people of the United States of America, in order that we as a nation may not be placed in an embarrassing position with regard to any diplomatic relations with Russia, and I suggested that an order be issued recalling our Ambassador to

Russia and that all diplomatic relations with Russia cease at that time.

Subsequent to this, on January 3, I introduced a bill calling for an authorization of a \$60,000,000 loan to Finland for the general requirements of that Nation.

I fully realize that the breaking off of diplomatic relations with Russia would not lend material aid to Finland. Why do I say that we should give Finland material aid? Because of the fact that, if Russia should be able to crush Finland, she would then be in a position to move into the northern part of Europe. She would then be of some use to Germany and Hitler, and until she crushes Finland she will be of no use to Hitler or Germany. If she becomes of use to Hitler and Germany, and they join together and take over the Balkans and move to take over Norway and Sweden, a totalitarian government will reign throughout Europe. This type of government will be in complete control of Europe, and when they do, the very foundation of democracy in this country will be in danger.

If we give this aid to Finland, it is not going to be just an ordinary gift, it is going to be a loan, but at the same time it is going to be more than that. It is going to be an insurance policy to this Nation against the invasion of those godless elements in this Nation and the best insurance policy that we can have.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. SECCOMBE. I appreciate the gentleman's friendly sentiments toward Finland, but would the gentleman mind stating whether he received a letter in return to the one he sent the President?

Mr. HOOK. I received a letter in reply with the information that was presented on the floor today, that they needed a listening post in Russia, and that they would be in a better position to be able to sit in on a peace conference and aid Finland in that way and protect her if they had an Ambassador than if they did not have one.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOOK. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. There is a matter I think the gentleman might clear up, in view of the sentiment in this House in favor of a loan to Finland, which is a reflection, I think, of the sentiment all over the country, as to why no move in that direction has been made. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that the only reason the Foreign Affairs Committee has not gone ahead with the consideration of this bill is that that committee has 15 members of the majority party and 10 of the minority, and the President has not given the Democratic members of that committee a green light on the matter.

Mr. HOOK. I know nothing about that. I know nothing about any green light from the President. I do know the President and this administration will and are giving their support to aid to Finland. They will act as soon as the Ways and Means Committee brings out this bill before them.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman knows the President has not expressed his approval to the committee.

Mr. HOOK. I know the bill is not before the Foreign Affairs Committee; it is before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MOTT. Such a bill is before both committees.

Mr. HOOK. The bill I introduced provides for a \$60,000,000 loan for the general requirements of that country, and can be made in accordance with ordinary channels of commerce between countries; and if we do not allow that, we are putting a premium on aggression.

Mr. MOTT. There is such a bill before both committees, I will inform the gentleman—the Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Service buildings fund: For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act to provide additional funds for buildings for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States" (52 Stat. 441), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said act, \$300,000, to remain available until expended, and in addition the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into contracts for such purpose during the fiscal year 1941

in an amount of not to exceed \$100,000: *Provided*, That whenever a contract is made for the construction, alteration, or repair of a Foreign Service building which requires payments in a foreign currency, the Secretary of State is authorized to purchase such currency at such times and in such amounts (within the total amount of the payments to be made under such contract) as he may deem necessary, the currency so purchased to be disbursed and accounted for at its cost price: *Provided further*, That this authorization shall also apply to the funds available to the Secretary of State under prior appropriations for the construction of Foreign Service buildings.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that there has been no debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEAL). To what paragraph does the request of the gentleman from Florida refer?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I am agreeable to that request. I really rose, Mr. Chairman, to consume the time of the Committee, because I was looking for the gentleman from Massachusetts. I did not know the gentleman was here.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there has been no debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I took this time because in looking for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], who is to propose an amendment on the next page, I did not see him sitting here, and I took the time in order to protect his rights. As long as I have the time I shall use it to discuss the same subject that has been before the Committee—namely, the recognition of Soviet Russia. When Soviet Russia was recognized by the President of the United States certain very definite promises were made to the American people, and, as other speakers have already said, most of those promises have been repudiated. These Communists are the most skillful propagandists in the world, so when they wanted America to recognize Soviet Russia they dangled before the eyes of the American people, and particularly of big-business men and the international bankers in New York State, a great juicy bait, and said, "If you will recognize Soviet Russia, we will do \$1,000,000,000 worth of business with you"; and the big bankers and the internationalists and the businessmen, and the industrialists all jumped on the band wagon for recognition. They then went down south into the Southern States, where cotton is king, and said, "If you will recognize Soviet Russia we will do \$200,000,000 worth of cotton business with you; we will buy \$200,000,000 worth of cotton from the Southern States"; and the good old Methodists and Baptists of the South, who hated Russia because the Soviets had denied and repudiated God and all religion and spread class hatred and world revolution—those good Baptists and Methodists, when the bait of \$200,000,000 worth of cotton was dangled before their eyes, put aside their scruples and their consciences and also jumped on the band wagon and had their Senators and even their Representatives favor the recognition of Soviet Russia.

So this bait won over the international bankers and the industrialists of the North and the cotton people of the South, and then what happened? Recognition was granted, but instead of doing one billion worth of trade they did \$25,000,000 worth of trade in a year, and under Republican administrations prior to recognition the facts will show that we did \$100,000,000 worth of business with Soviet Russia. Since recognition we have done \$25,000,000 worth of annual trade with Soviet Russia. Instead of buying \$200,000,000 worth of cotton from the Southern States they bought, I think it was, three and a half million dollars worth of cotton, and they borrowed that money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to put over the deal. But the skillful propaganda, based on business hopes, appealed to the South and appealed to the Northern States, and the promise of an

enormous amount of trade won over those who were in opposition to recognition. Now, after 7 years of complete failure to live up to any of their promises or pledges, particularly those promises for increased trade, is it not time for the Congress of the United States to act? I admit that this is not the proper procedure, far from it. There is not a Member on either side of the House who believes that this is the proper procedure, but it is the only chance we have. If we want to sever diplomatic relations, this is the only hope, the only way that we will ever have in this Congress to express our views and our sentiments and our solemn convictions. Is there anything wrong in Republicans or Democrats seizing this opportunity to express their views and the views of their constituents who want to sever diplomatic relations and have nothing to do with this country that denies God and spreads revolution all over the world, including the United States of America? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 10 percent of any of the foregoing appropriations under the caption "Foreign intercourse" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other foregoing appropriation or appropriations under such caption for such fiscal year, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby: *Provided*, That all such transfers and contemplated transfers shall be set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 17, after line 14, insert: "*Provided*, That no appropriations contained under the caption 'Foreign intercourse' shall be used for the maintenance of an embassy of the United States in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or for salaries or any character of expense, other than salaries, for the maintenance of any office or officer of the United States State Department in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the vote taken on a similar proposition to this a short time ago was very close—105 to 108. I am serving notice now that if I can get the floor I shall move to recommit the bill, with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the amendments adopted. The pending amendment brings flatly before the Committee again the question that I attempted to bring when I tried to have the three amendments considered together. If the chairman of the subcommittee had agreed to that, the debate would have been over and settled by the vote taken on the first occasion.

Mr. Chairman, the very fact that 105 Members in the Committee voted in favor of this proposition indicates a very strong feeling in support of the effort that I am making on this occasion. I dare say that of the 108 Members who voted against the proposition, every one is opposed to what Soviet Russia stands for.

However, I wonder if they realize they were not consulted when the Litvinov agreement was entered into. The question of the recognition of Soviet Russia was not submitted to the Senate of the United States. Now, when they talk about "sentimentality," they are rather inconsistent in their position, because we were not consulted on that occasion, and this is the only opportunity we have of acting in our own right in expressing our views and the views of our constituents on this important matter.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I did not talk with Secretary Hull. [Laughter.]

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is what I wanted to ask the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. I told the gentleman privately and the gentleman told me he was going to ask me the question. I anticipated it by telling the gentleman that I did not.

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is what the gentleman told me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, someone talks about being "taken off our feet by sentimentality." The sentiment is on the part of those who have a fear of communism, who have

a fear of the Soviet Union. I hear some of them talk about Finland. I will vote for a loan to Finland without reservation. I will vote for a loan to Finland to buy munitions and implements of war. If we can loan money to Finland under the guise of Government credit for the purpose of buying agricultural products, we can make a loan to Finland for any purpose, without reservation.

We hear those who oppose the amendment talk that way, but certainly they did not vote the way they feel. They talk about Finland. If we took action today, it would be a message which would be chronicled throughout the world. It would do more to inspire the courageous people of Finland, short of other real material assistance, than anything this country could do.

Soviet Russia has broken every promise it has ever made. It never has kept a promise. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] that the Karelian Peninsula is the front-line trenches for western civilization. That is what I assume he had in mind. The Finns are making battle against those vicious forces that are not only desirous of conquest, but are determined to destroy the origin of western civilization—religion itself. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] made his statement, I assume that is what he had in mind. If so, I thoroughly agree with him.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, said if we wanted to help the Bolsheviks this was the way to do it. I respect my distinguished friend, but I remember when I was before the Committee on the Judiciary trying to get a bill out to make it a crime for "a person to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence." I could not get it out of his committee. That amendment was put onto another bill last year, you will remember. I could not get it out of the Committee on the Judiciary to make it a crime for anyone "to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of government by force or violence."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not ask for legislation confining it to "advocate." My bill provided that anyone who "knowingly or willfully advocated." What American can be opposed to that bill? Of course, the Committee on the Judiciary is composed of fine men and sincere, but I could not get that bill out of the Committee on the Judiciary. I wonder how some of my friends in the House on both sides feel when they realize that statement; and yet, when the amendment was offered in the House, it was overwhelmingly adopted. It reflected the sentiment of the Members of this House. It reflected the sentiment of the people of the United States.

There is no official diplomatic recognition of Russia. It is semidiplomatic, simply an exchange of letters, and it only exists by sufferance. The President can recall the Ambassador any time he wants to. This is not a question of whether there has been official recognition by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. KERR. Why did not the distinguished gentleman come before our committee and make a statement with respect to this legislation and sit down quietly and calmly with us and talk it over and see what could be done about it?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a perfectly proper question. Of course, in the first place, I have a hesitancy about appearing before committees when all I know is what has been testified to after the hearings are over and printed. I recognize there might be some logic for that. But the Committee on Appropriations is not like any other committee. My experience is that they do not hold public hearings like any other committee.

Furthermore, a Member is not compelled to appear before a committee. A Member has his own rights as a Member of the House. To be frank with my friend, you know, and

I know, that if I appeared before the committee it would have been useless. The subcommittee would not have made any recommendation. I knew it had to be done by the House. The quicker our Ambassador is recalled from the Soviet Union, either by this action or by the President, the better for our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of heat generated here on a question which I think is very important and which should be determined upon practical consideration of facts rather than prejudice or feeling. No Member of this House has any greater conviction of hostility against communism both here and abroad than myself. The question pending before us, however, is not whether communism is good or bad; not whether the United States acted wisely or unwisely in recognizing Russia; not whether Russia kept her promise or broke it; the sole question now to be considered is whether or not the severance of diplomatic relations at this time and the withdrawal of our Ambassador from Russia at this time will help or hurt the United States of America. [Applause.] Any other argument on any other line begs the question and is an appeal to passion and prejudice. I appeal to the House in passing upon this important question which affects not only our own country but Finland as well, to use our sound, sober judgment.

The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] is confined to his bed with illness and cannot be here. As a member of that committee I may say to the House that the question now pending is one to which I have given some thought and consideration. I am not acting upon impulse in what I say but upon an investigation of the facts with reference to the effect this resolution may have. I say candidly, and I say it with all the earnestness of my soul, that the adoption of the resolution to withdraw recognition of Russia and withdraw our Ambassador at this time will hurt the United States of America and will hurt Finland. [Applause.] If anybody challenges my statement, I would like to hear from him right now.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Is the gentleman in favor of withdrawing our Ambassador from Germany?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; I am not, and we have not done so. We have not withdrawn our Ambassador from Germany. He is here on temporary leave.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Who is here on temporary leave from Germany?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Our Ambassador to Germany.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman mean our very able former Ambassador, Mr. Hugh Wilson.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand he resigned as Ambassador.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not sure about that, but I do know he came home on leave. At any rate, the Embassy in Germany is not vacant, and we have representatives in Germany now carrying on our Embassy in Berlin.

If we withdraw our representative from Russia, what do we do? What will it profit us and how will such an act benefit Finland? Our Embassy and Ambassador to Russia not only looks after the rights of American citizens but we are also enabled to get the facts as to what is happening there. When we had no representative in Russia our Government had to depend upon hearsay as to what was happening. One party would bring one report and another party a different report, and the State Department was in doubt as to the true condition of affairs in Russia. Now, with a war raging and with conditions as they are, more than ever before in our history do we need diplomatic representatives there; and we have as our Ambassador to Russia a very able man who, I am told

by the State Department, is doing a splendid job in representing us and getting the facts and in looking after our interests.

It is important also that we maintain our Embassy in Russia so that this Government, having its representatives there, can get information and facts for our Government to use in its dealings not only with that country but other countries. So far as Finland is concerned, you are not helping Finland—you are not helping the United States at this critical time—by severing diplomatic relations or withdrawing our Ambassador.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not a fact, since the gentleman and myself and most of us do not want to do anything that would be helpful to Russia, that the withdrawing of our Ambassador from Russia would be a blow at our own interests?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Absolutely. We would simply be making a gesture—a foolish gesture and a dangerous gesture—that would have no practical effect in the way of hurting Russia. We would be hurting only our own country, and we would be hurting Finland.

Do you think this is the place, do you think this is the forum, as an amendment to an appropriation bill to consider whether the relations of our Government should be severed, where the matter cannot be discussed, nor its significance, with all the facts, brought before the House? Do you think we should vote upon a matter of this kind when we do not know what the effect will be? I think I know what the effect will be, because I have investigated this question from every angle. Unlike my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], with whom I usually agree, I have been to the State Department and I have obtained information from sources which cannot be questioned outright. I am sure if some of the Members of the House had, they would not have voted as they did today, because the effect is going to be hurtful rather than helpful.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I agree with my beloved colleague on the committee that this is probably not the best way to do it, but he made the statement that if this amendment is agreed to, it will injure the United States of America. I wish he would tell us in a few words exactly how that will be done.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is a very reasonable question. In the first place it will hurt us because we will have no diplomatic representative over there to look after our own citizens who may be there at this very critical time. It will hurt us also in that we will not know what is happening in Russia so that we can gage our conduct with Finland and other countries accordingly. In this grave crisis it is necessary that we find out all the facts we can at this time. In time of peace it may not be so important to have a representative, but in time of war when other countries are threatening and no one knows what will happen, it is highly important that we have our Ambassador there to get all of the facts, to determine our conduct and relations to Russia and the other countries of the world. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very tense feeling that any Member of Congress or any American citizen might have over the situation that has been discussed here today. I do not believe anyone will accuse me of being particularly sympathetic with the Communists when they recall the fact that I have already been burned in effigy twice in public squares by the Communists in New York and some other places for the activities of the W. P. A. investigating committee in seeking to rid our relief rolls of Communists and their influence. It seems to me when we, sitting in the Committee of the Whole, more or less in an ex parte manner, by the control of small appropriation items, undertake to fix or seriously influence the foreign policy of our country, we are getting into very deep water and on very dangerous ground.

I heard some gentlemen here today advocating this drastic and significant action who on other occasions were inveighing against alleged tactics by the administration which they claim were seeking to put America into war; yet I cannot think of anything that the Congress could do; I do not know of any way we could commit a greater affront to a nation that as a power at present is on friendly relations with America, than by the action which is proposed here in this amendment.

If the question in issue here were whether or not America would recognize Russia, then I nor any of my colleagues would have any difficulty in voting on the question. Of course, you would not recognize it. The attitude of that Communist country, the manner in which it has persecuted all religious denominations, the manner in which it has ground down its own citizens and taken their rights away from them, the outrageous invasion of Finland, and all of its other acts are repulsive to every impulse of liberty and freedom that any red blooded American citizen could have, yet there is a proper time and place in which to fix the important foreign policies of our country, and this is not the time nor the place. Whatever may be our attitude toward some policies of the present administration, I believe the one man who has handled his job above reproach is Cordell Hull. In a most critical period, fraught with grave danger, he has done a magnificent job in handling the foreign affairs of this country [applause], and it seems to me that the action which we are proposing here today in withholding a small appropriation for the Embassy at Moscow is most untimely, and impugns the administration of our Secretary of State. I want to plead with the House of Representatives not to take snap judgment on this matter. It is not a question whether we approve or disapprove of Russia's invasion of Finland. Of course we do not. There would not be a vote in this body to approve of that. As has been pointed out, the suggested action would in nowise aid Finland or injure Russia. There is a proper time, a proper place, and a proper forum under our system of government in which these matters of foreign policy are determined and handled, and not collaterally by taking out a small item of an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that this amendment and any other similar amendment will not be accepted by the Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the tribute paid by the gentleman to the administration of the Department of the Secretary of State, but I believe we should also be informed whether or not it is a fact that the files of that Department will show that every one of our representatives in Europe concerned with the Russian situation immediately prior to its recognition recommended against recognition of Russia at that time. If that is a fact it seems to me it has a very material bearing upon the policy with which we are here concerned. I say this because the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Texas and others,

are doubtless accorded the privilege of knowing what were the reports of our representatives on the borders of Russia immediately prior to our recognition of this regime.

RUSSIAN GOLD

I want to address myself more specifically, however, to the theory of the listening post in Russia. We have been hearing a great deal recently about the matter of Russian gold. The Secretary of the Treasury states that he does not know and is utterly unable to find out how much Russian gold is being produced or what is its distribution. I want to suggest that if our Ambassador in Russia is not able to learn these facts there is within the bounds of the United States now a gentleman who for 9 long years up to 1939 was in charge of all Soviet gold production.

Why is this a matter of concern? If it be a fact that this Government has taken \$1,000,000,000 of Russian gold in the last 5 years, as is by many asserted, it means that we have not only given that amount of exchange to Russia but we have given the Soviet Government a profit of hundreds of millions of dollars. It is estimated that Russian gold may be produced in vast quantities for less than \$15 an ounce. Yet we pay \$35 an ounce for every ounce shipped to our shores from anywhere in the world. This means that in buying \$1,000,000,000 in gold the United States gives Russia a profit of approximately \$600,000,000 for gold that probably could not be sold elsewhere—certainly not at any such price.

JOHN D. LITTLEPAGE

John D. Littlepage is the name of the gentleman to whom I refer, whose book, *In Search of Soviet Gold*, reveals the most intimate knowledge of gold production in Russia throughout the last decade.

It is no answer to the suggestion that America has been financing Russia through this period to support this communistic regime to say that all the gold in our Treasury is stamped with the mark of Britain, France, or the Netherlands. This may simply mean that Europe has sold us a billion dollars' worth of European gold and replaced that gold with a billion dollars of gold from Russia, to maintain Europe as the international gold broker, which in my judgment is actually the fact.

Mr. Littlepage sought to discover why Russia did not increase its production of gold. He was told by an international authority on finance, as he reveals in the book to which I have referred, that Russia did not dump more gold on the world market because Europe thought the United States was now taking about its limit, and they did not wish to kill this golden goose. These international gold buccaneers have dumped gold on our country until we now have 65 percent of all the gold to be found in all the world.

I would suggest that the Secretary of the Treasury seek out Mr. Littlepage to tell us a few elemental facts about Russian gold production and distribution, since our Embassy seems unable to ferret out the truth.

I would not say that our novel gold policy was designed to bolster the tottering economy of Communist Russia. That, however, has been one of its unfortunate effects. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE].

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I was quite a bit surprised at the vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whom I admire very much. Since the beginning of the debate on this amendment the gentleman from Massachusetts has very frankly told us that he has not consulted Secretary of State Hull about this matter at all. With that frank statement it is impossible for me to conceive why any man, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, would want to commit this Congress upon so important a matter without even consulting the man who is charged with the responsibility of handling that Department of the Government of the United States.

I can say one thing, however. We have a gentleman on the Republican side who seems to act as the minority Secretary of State. He never misses an opportunity to get up here and say something about the foreign policy of the United States.

Even between sessions of the Congress he makes trips across the ocean and when he gets there rides in airplanes to the various countries that are at war or about to get into war, and then comes back here and announces what the foreign policy of the Government of the United States ought to be.

At one time I believe I spoke of the gentleman—and I have a very high regard for him—as a Secretary of State in waiting. If he is not that, I do not know how to describe him. He is not satisfied with Secretary Hull's administration of the foreign policy of this Government. I hope he will be patient enough, at least, not to unhorse Mr. Hull now, but will wait until after the November elections, when perhaps he may realize that long-nursed ambition of his to direct the foreign affairs of this country.

As I stated a while ago, it seems quite absurd for this Congress to adopt this amendment, notwithstanding the very high regard and affection we all have for the author of the amendment. It is just too dangerous for us to be fiddling with an action such as this without some advice from someone who is responsible to this Government and knows what ought to be done about it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly interested in the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], that if we had a chance to vote at this moment on the question whether or not we should recognize Russia, there would be no question about the result of the vote. That statement has gone forth to the administration, that without question this House would go on record, if they had a chance to vote on the question properly, that we would not approve recognition of Russia. Therefore, his argument seems to be that it will be too bad to deprive our Ambassador of his salary. This is the one forum we have for expressing ourselves on these matters, so what harm is there, even in this back-handed way, in our taking this action? If we had an opportunity to vote on the question directly, the gentleman says we would express ourselves as against it. Then why not do it this way? I doubt very much if that gentleman over in Russia finds out anything the Russian Government does not want him to know.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the Ambassador in Russia is so necessary or essential or valuable, or is doing such a good job, why was it impossible for the commander of the *City of Flint* to contact him at the time his ship was tied up in the harbor at Murmansk?

Mr. GIFFORD. I believe everybody understands that our Ambassador to Russia finds out nothing that the Russian Government does not care for him to know. They are undoubtedly making a mountebank of him.

The point I wish to make, however, is that this is the only way we have of expressing ourselves. I have no hesitation in saying that if all it amounts to is refusing the salary of that gentleman, let us do it. I might remind the House that if we vote it out, we do the job. If we wanted to let him stay there at his own expense, we probably could not accept his services. I do not know but that probably some of you might want to vote to leave \$1 in this appropriation in order to make him a dollar-a-year man, so that he can represent us legally if he stays there.

A gentleman who preceded me said they could not find out how much gold Russia had imported. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve say we have not bought an ounce of gold as such, but we have only taken it in ordinary business transactions. Indirectly we have taken the gold; everybody knows that. Russia can buy our securities and then sell them the next day and take our good dollars for them. We do not have to buy gold as such from Russia. It is difficult, you know, to listen to explanatory speeches founded on simple facts from the Federal Reserve and from the administration. We have to look into them very care-

fully and learn the indirect results obtained. Of course, Russian gold indirectly has found its way here, and we have helped finance her war in Finland.

I am not afraid. I want to extend help to Finland. I am ready to vote direct aid. I repeat what I once quoted here not long ago in the words of Daniel Webster:

Three thousand miles of ocean roll between; we are safe; but we belong to the family of nations.

Can we not at least protest? If my vote here today could only be interpreted, I would like to have you interpret it as "Hurrah for Finland!"

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does not the gentleman think that even before we withdraw the money for the Ambassador to Russia we ought to withdraw the money for the Ambassador to Berlin, who is not even serving.

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, we cannot explain that situation. To fully comment on the many peculiar actions of this administration would take a long time. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure if we were taking a poll expressing opposition of Congress to bolshevism or communism, it would be practically unanimous, but, unfortunately, this legislation does not permit of such a poll today.

I cannot help but think of the inconsistency of the arguments we are making today compared with those we were making less than 6 months ago, when discussing the neutrality bill. The gentleman who preceded me referred to the withdrawal of our Ambassador from Russia, and a number of others have expressed their individual opinions about the matter. If it were left to me personally, I would not have had any Ambassador in Russia to begin with, but that is a matter heretofore left with our President or State Department, and while I recognize we have the right to make or refuse to make an appropriation for such a diplomatic post, I think it is nothing short of our duty that we try to maintain friendly relations with all nations.

Less than 6 months ago men stood in this Chamber here and pleaded, with tears in their eyes as big as little apples, for the passage of a neutrality law in order to keep this country out of war. They were pleading in response to the will and desires of the American people that this country should take no action that would involve us in a foreign war; and yet we hear some of these same gentlemen here today—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for instance—rising on the floor of this House and saying that he is now willing to vote to supply and send arms and munitions of war to Finland, a country that is already in war. There is no doubt but that such action would be a flagrant breach of our neutrality law, which he so ably defended and supported last year. In other words, he is willing, by his statement and actions today, to take the first step that will inevitably lead us into a foreign war. I would not dare question his motives, but when he speaks of sending arms and munitions to a country already in war, which would be in violation of our neutrality law, I cannot overlook the fact that he comes from a State in which there are large shipbuilding interests and many munitions plants.

I have unbounded sympathy for Finland, and I have no sympathy whatever with the Government of Soviet Russia or any of its social or governmental teachings or institutions. As a matter of fact, I would personally like to see every vestige of communism or Russianism wiped off the face of the earth, but I am not willing at this time to take an unprovoked action that may involve us in war and require us to send millions of young men into a foreign country and sacrifice their lives simply to satisfy my personal likes or dislikes. There can be no doubt but that the passage of this amendment will be a reflection and an insult to Russia. As I have already stated, I hold no brief for Russia; I have no sympathy whatever for Russia or any of its institutions; but

I know that one of the easiest ways in the world to get into a fight is to slap an enemy in the face.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. Does the gentleman recall, when the same gentleman from Massachusetts made his speech last year on the neutrality bill, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said, "That is the most warlike speech we have had since the World War"?

Mr. HARE. I do not recall the exact language, but I do know the two gentlemen referred to were then on opposite sides of the neutrality question, and the gentleman's observation is just another concrete illustration of the inconsistency of their actions here today.

We cannot fool the American people about getting into war. They want this country to stay out of any and all foreign wars, and they do not want this Congress to go around with a chip on its shoulder giving dares to people simply because we do not like the way they do things. Sooner or later it will get you into trouble. To withdraw diplomatic relations with Russia now simply because we do not approve of her form of government or the way she acts toward other nations—we would for the same reason be compelled to withdraw diplomatic relations with Germany, Japan, and other foreign countries, which we know sooner or later will mean war for us. Of course, if there is anything to be gained, I would readily be willing to cut out this appropriation of \$17,500, but I am not willing to take the chance of becoming involved in a foreign war on account of so little an amount of money. That is, I am not willing to take the chance of sending the young men from my district to a foreign war for the pitiful sum of \$17,500, which is the amount involved in this amendment. It is not worth the sacrifice of the life of even one man.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, when the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] stated that he favored the extension of loans to Finland for the purpose of purchasing military supplies, I interrogated him and asked whether he thought it would not be more effective to send American youth to help Finland fight against the onslaughts of the Russian armies. I did not propound that question because I was in favor of that step, and I want it distinctly understood at this time that I am opposed to extending aid to Finland for the purchase of military supplies, because I believe to do so would be an unneutral position and would ultimately lead to our involvement in the war which is now raging in northern Europe.

I voted against the McCormack amendment because I believed that to take such action at this time, to withdraw our diplomatic representative from Russia, would be an unneutral act, and I am opposed to doing anything at this time which is inconsistent with the neutrality policy which was adopted by Congress during the special session.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is not the breaking off of diplomatic relations the first step toward war?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Whether it is or not, I am opposed to breaking off diplomatic relations with any country at this time, believing that the United States should take a distinctly neutral position and not become involved or influenced in any way by our emotions or sympathies.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of Members here to history. There was probably no more bloody revolution in recent times than the French Revolution, and yet within 3 weeks, I believe it was, at least it was only a few weeks, Washington and Jefferson, two men we highly regard in the United States today, recognized the Republic of France. Why? Because it was a de facto government. By recognizing a government you do not thereby approve what they do or what they stand for. You simply say that that is a de facto government, and therefore that we recognize it. We recognized the czarist regimes for decades. Did we thereby approve what the czars stood for? Of course not. Now, if we

are going to sever diplomatic relations with Russia, it must follow that we must also sever diplomatic relations with Germany; but I do not hear these gentlemen from Wisconsin or my good friend from New York [Mr. FISH] who rode in von Ribbentrop's airplane saying that we should sever relations with them, and yet the Hitler government denies God. Hitler has abused us and denounced democracy. When he raped Poland and laid it waste, did these gentlemen take the floor to denounce him? Then we must also sever relations with Italy. When Mussolini ravaged Abyssinia, did these gentlemen arise to protest? The Governments of Russia, Italy, and Germany are all alike, and we must treat them all in the same manner.

Mr. FISH rose.

Mr. HILL. I have not the time. Because Germany and Italy have done the same as Russia, and we have the same thing against Germany and Italy that we have against Russia. I cannot yield. In conclusion may I read from two esteemed gentlemen. I am not very much of an admirer of the great Al Smith, but at least you cannot call him a Bolshevik or say he favors communism. On page 1543 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1933, he is quoted by Senator Borah in this manner:

Russian propaganda in this and other countries is also offered as a reason against recognition. I don't know how widespread Russian propaganda is, and I don't believe anyone else knows. In fact, there is considerable doubt as to whether the Russian Government actually is attempting to undermine other governments. If so, I am not afraid of what it will accomplish here.

And then to my Republican friends I quote from that distinguished statesman whose keen mind and unquestioned integrity we all honored and whose funeral I had the honor of attending in Boise. Senator Borah, who was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had this to say:

If I did not believe in the intelligence and the patriotism of the people of the United States, I might be afraid that they would be misled by propaganda of that kind; but as I do believe in their intelligence and patriotism I have no such fear whatever. I am not willing to base our foreign policies upon the theory that our own people are weaklings, susceptible to every intellectual wind that blows.

May I say, my good friends, that if we in this country set our house in order and solve the farm problem and the unemployment problem, bolshevism and nazi-ism and fascism can get no hold in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman who just spoke wants it to go into the RECORD that the German people are antigod, and I do not believe any other Member of Congress believes that the German people have repudiated God; and if that is what he said, and he wants to keep it in the RECORD, it is his privilege to do so, but I am sure that that is not what he meant.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman deny that Hitler denies God and religion?

Mr. FISH. I never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Hitler or discussing religion with him. I am talking about the German people and that is what the gentleman said. The German people believe in God just as much as the gentleman does, just as much as the American people believe in God. It is an entirely different thing, recognizing Russia that has repudiated God and all religion and teaches hatred of God and all religion, and Germany.

Mr. HILL. The Russian people have not.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman will find out about the Germans, and what they think in America, the people of German origin, as to whether they believe in God, and whether they think their relatives believe in God.

I never have defended Hitlerism. I was the one who introduced the first resolution against the persecution of the Jews by Hitler. I never, never said that I was in favor of Hitler or any foreign dictatorship, and I want that to go into the RECORD. I never defended any foreign dictatorship—never. I

am more against dictatorships than any man in the House, and I am just as much against dictatorship at home. [Applause.] I am against a dictatorship in Russia the same as I am in Germany or in the United States. It is none of our business what form of government exists in Germany or Russia, but very much our business that there is no kind of dictatorship in our own country.

I am getting a little tired of these references to "rides in airplanes," when even Prime Minister Chamberlain, Premier Mussolini, and others rode in the same airplane, and an American Congressman cannot travel in the plane of the German Foreign Minister without having his patriotism and Americanism impugned. I do not know what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] did in the World War, either. [Laughter.]

This question of recognition of Soviet Russia is no new matter. It was an international lie from the beginning. It was when we recognized Soviet Russia. It is still, and it will continue to be as long as the Communists are in control of Soviet Russia. As I have said, it is none of our business what form of government they have in Soviet Russia or in Nazi Germany or in Fascist Italy, and it is none of their business what form of government we have in the United States of America; but it is our business when foreign nations, like Communist Russia, interfere with our free institutions and republican form of government. It then becomes very much our business to prevent the spread of communism in our own country, and we intend to make it our business, and on every opportunity I have to sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia on that ground alone I propose to take it. The opportunity is here in the House of Representatives. Have we got the courage to take it or will we say, "Wait until some other time," as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] said. "This is not the time. This may be harmful to us." What good is an Ambassador in Soviet Russia? What good was our Ambassador when the *City of Flint* was seized? He could not even communicate with the captain of the *City of Flint*, who was at Murmansk for a week. What good is an Ambassador there? What does he know about the production of gold in Soviet Russia and the sale of gold to us at twice or three times the cost of production? It has been said it would be harmful to Finland. How in the world could it be harmful to Finland to repudiate Soviet Russia now? That is what I want to know. That is what the American people have a right to know. If you send out word that the majority of this House has voted to sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia, nothing could help Finland more in its fight for independence and liberty and encourage them to continue their battle for democracy and Christianity.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think, if it should go out that this Congress voted unanimously, after this question came up, much as we deprecate the fact that it has come up in this way, but if it should go out that we voted unanimously against this amendment, every newspaper in Russia will say that we had endorsed and recognized and approved the Russian policy?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. It is too bad it has come up now, because if it is voted down that will be the effect in spite of the fact that 90 percent of the American people want to have nothing to do with Soviet Russia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to appear on the floor so frequently. When you listen to one of these calm, deliberate speeches like we have just listened to from the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] [laughter], and see and appreciate that the statesmen of a great Republic have assembled deliberately to consider a major matter such as we are now considering, and then when a fellow makes a

fiery speech like I am making, it is just out of order. [Laughter.]

This is one of the most remarkable proceedings I have observed since I have been a Member of this House. On the spur of the moment, by an amendment to an appropriation bill, with reference to which no prior notice has been given, it is proposed, in effect, to sever diplomatic relations with Russia. Now, what do you propose to do? We have a lot of talk about bolshevist and Finland. I have not heard anybody here get down to cases and state what benefit is going to come to any of the countries with whom we sympathize as a result of the action here proposed, or what harm is going to come to Russia if this amendment is adopted. Our Secretary of State, our diplomatic agent, struggling with all the involved diplomatic problems arising out of many nations at war, is not even consulted. Just think about that for a minute—grown people charged with a great responsibility actually proposing to do this thing. I am very certain that the only benefit that will come to anybody will come to Russia if we should pass this amendment. We are not going to do anything to them, but the Russian leaders would immediately be able to appeal to their people that they should stand together, because this great Government is undertaking to run the business of Russia. Can anybody overestimate the benefit of such an appeal? Suppose this were reversed, what would our reaction be? This is one of the most remarkable situations I have ever seen. Here we have a system of three coordinate branches of the Government. We have a man—Cordell Hull—employed by those people to have responsibility, in the first instance, for taking care of our diplomatic arrangements. I am not going to embarrass the people who have been voting to take this control away in the first instance by asking how many of them have sat down in calm, deliberate discussion with Cordell Hull and suggested to him that this thing should be done. I venture the statement that there is nobody, and if there is anybody, I will yield for him to stand in his place and say so. I will not exclude my distinguished friend who is a candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the Republican ticket. I yield to him to state that he went up there to the Department of State and gave his views to the Secretary of State that this thing ought to be done.

We are saying to the world today, at a time when Cordell Hull is the only person in the first instance to handle the diplomatic relationships of this country, that we are undertaking to take that responsibility away from the Department of State in the first instance; that we have no confidence in the Secretary of State. The only thing we do is to weaken the hands of the Secretary of State in undertaking to deal with the difficult and dangerous problems of this country at this moment. I will venture that you cannot find in the history of this country anything comparable to what is taking place in this Chamber right now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the gentleman inform us where Secretary Hull was when the arrangement was made for recognition of Russia?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Unfortunately, I do not follow him around all of the time. I do most of the time, but that was one time when I was not on the job.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the gentleman recall that Secretary Hull sailed for South America and the President himself made the arrangements with Litvinov after Hull had departed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know where he was. One very significant thing about this whole matter apparent to me and to everybody else is that somehow or other on the Republican side you followed a little too regularly a certain gentleman from Massachusetts on this thing. It looks a little like politics, and this is a mighty poor time and place to be playing it.

Mr. JOHNS. Rubber stamps?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I would not say rubber stamps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with my colleague from Texas that this is an amazing situation. There never has been a time in my 27 years of service in this House, it matters not who was the President of the United States or who was Secretary of State, when in a proceeding like this I would have voted to abrogate the ancient and fundamental policy of the Government of the United States in foreign affairs.

The outcome of the question now before us cannot be put upon the ground of what we think about Russia, what we think about the form of government in Russia, or what Russia has done to the little democracy of Finland. This action here today will not help Finland. This action here today will not hurt Russia. Let me repeat what was so well said by my colleague from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], that this action will make a more determined and a more resistless Russia to go about doing more of the things she should not do.

Are we, the Congress of the United States, going to sever diplomatic relations by an amendment like this with every country on the face of the earth with whose form of government we do not agree? Do you endorse the Government of Japan? Do you endorse in toto the government in Italy, or in Germany, or in a dozen other countries throughout the length and breadth of the world? Whether or not some people wanted the United States to resume diplomatic relations with Russia, it has been done, and done by the people who had the authority to do it.

It is dangerous ground, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, upon which we tread today. The international situation is tense, and I was so impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE], buttressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. Is there a man in this House who has spoken in favor of this amendment, or who intends to vote for it, who has given the Secretary of State the privilege, the poor privilege, of talking to him or her about not only the Russian situation but the situation in other parts of the earth and with other countries?

I do plead with my colleagues at this hour: Be mighty careful, it is a dangerous situation that faces the whole earth. Let us, therefore, not do a thing here in passion and lack of reason that might embarrass this country beyond the poor limits of the patience and fortitude of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, all I care to say about this amendment is that now we have mauled it around, knocked it about, and played politics with it we ought to do the sensible thing and vote it down. No one has offered a single reason why it should be approved. No one has pointed to a single benefit which will accrue to this country if it be adopted. There must be a limit beyond which prejudice and politics cannot go.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCORMACK) there were—ayes 38, noes 95.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of the annual contributions, quotas, and expenses, including loss by exchange in discharge of the obligations of the United States in connection with international commissions, congresses, bureaus, and other objects, in not to exceed the respective amounts, as follows: Cape Spartel and Tangier Light, coast of Morocco, \$1,176; International Bureau of Weights and Measures, \$4,342.50; International Bureau of Publication of Customs Tariffs, \$1,318.77; Pan American Union, \$239,458.70, including not to exceed

\$20,000 for printing and binding; International Bureau of Permanent Court of Arbitration, \$1,722.57; Bureau of Interparliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration, \$20,000, including not to exceed \$10,000 for the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, stenographic reporting services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), traveling expenses, purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, maps, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, and other necessary expenses to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group; International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy, \$48,756, including not to exceed \$11,700 for the salary of the American member of the permanent committee (at not more than \$7,500 per annum), compensation of subordinate employees without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, expenses for the maintenance of the office at Rome, including purchase of necessary books, maps, documents, and newspapers and periodicals (foreign and domestic), printing and binding, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), for the use of the American member of the permanent committee, and traveling and other necessary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State; Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, \$58,522.75; International Office of Public Health, \$3,015.63; Bureau of International Telecommunication Union, Radio Section, \$5,790; Inter-American Radio Office, \$3,655; Government of Panama, \$430,000; International Hydrographic Bureau, \$5,404; Inter-American Trade-Mark Bureau, \$14,330.20; International Bureau for Protection of Industrial Property, \$1,471.63; Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, \$50,000; *Provided*, That hereafter, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 491), the report of the operation and work of the laboratory, including the statement of the receipts and expenditures, shall be made to Congress during the first week of each regular session thereof, such a report to cover a fiscal year period ending on June 30 of the calendar year immediately preceding the convening of each such session; American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, \$2,000; International Statistical Bureau at The Hague, \$2,000; International Map of the World on the Millionth Scale, \$50; International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, \$6,745, including not to exceed \$6,500 for the expenses of participation by the Government of the United States in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and of the commissions established by that committee, including traveling expenses, personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), rent, purchase of necessary books, and documents, printing and binding, official cards, entertainment, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; Convention Relating to Liquor Traffic in Africa, \$55; International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, \$4,332, including not to exceed \$800 for the necessary expenses of the Commissioner to represent the United States on the Commission at its annual meetings, personal services without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, printing and binding, traveling expenses, and such other expenses as the Secretary of State may deem necessary; Permanent Association of International Road Congresses, \$588; International Labor Organization, \$163,511.64, including not to exceed \$5,901 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the meetings of the general conference and of the governing body of the International Labor Office and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services, without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, stenographic reporting and translating services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), rent, traveling expenses, purchase of books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and charts, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; Implementing the Narcotics Convention of 1931, \$10,551.85; International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions, as follows: International Council of Scientific Unions, \$19.30; International Astronomical Union, \$617.60; International Union of Chemistry, \$675; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, \$2,316; International Scientific Radio Union, \$232.40; International Union of Physics, \$62.72; International Geographical Union, \$125.44; and International Union of Biological Sciences, \$154.40; in all, \$4,202.86; and Pan American Institute of Geography and History, \$10,000; in all, \$1,093,000, together with such additional sums, due to increase in rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary to pay, in foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws establishing the amount of the obligation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 20, page 20, "International Labor Organization, \$163,511.64" and ending on page 21, line 11, with the words "Secretary of State" on the ground there is legislation contained in lines 1, 2, 5, and 10.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have an additional point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that points of order be taken up separately.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve another point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning with the word "Bureau", line 2, page 18, and ending with the word "group" in line 15, page 18.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the Chair tell us what point of order is before us at the moment?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two points of order pending. The gentleman from South Dakota raises a point of order against the language beginning in line 20, page 20, and ending with line 11, page 21.

The gentleman from New York raises an additional point of order against the language beginning in line 2, page 18, down to and including line 15, ending with the word "group."

Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think legislation is clearly included in the lines I cited.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. CALDWELL. May I ask that we take up the points of order one at a time?

The CHAIRMAN. We will take up the first point of order raised by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that here is legislation in an appropriation bill. The language provides that certain things shall be done "without reference to the Classification Act" and certain other things shall be done "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes," and it also includes this language: "And such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State," all of which is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think undoubtedly some of the language in that section is subject to a point of order. I am wondering if the gentleman would object to the elimination of the objectionable language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against all of the language in the portion of the bill cited. From what I have heard of this particular item, under the appropriation made last year, as many as four trips to Europe were made, and other things done which seem of questionable justification. Consequently, I am constrained to make the point of order to include the appropriation itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard further?

Mr. CALDWELL. Undoubtedly a portion of the language is subject to a point of order, but I think the purpose can only be accomplished by the inclusion of that language. I certainly cannot object to sustaining the point of order on the ground suggested by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The Chair will now hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on his point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language I previously referred to on the ground

it is legislation in an appropriation bill and covers items not authorized by law.

Mr. CALDWELL. Would the gentleman have any objection to eliminating the language complained of, which is subject to a point of order, and retention of the substance of that section?

Mr. TABER. I cannot agree to that because I do not believe the language I have included within the point of order serves a useful purpose. I believe that the Bureau of Inter-parliamentary Union should be done away with. It is not justified, and we should not in these days when economy is necessary have the item in the bill. I believe the House ought to vote on it separately if we are going to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the point of order be again stated to the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] makes a point of order against the language beginning in line 2, page 18, down to and including the words "American group," in line 15.

Mr. TABER. All of the language between those two points.

Mr. CALDWELL. Undoubtedly some of that language is subject to a point of order, and I cannot object to the Chair sustaining the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an authorization in there, but there is also legislation in an appropriation bill. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, the language of which will take the place of that stricken out on the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 20, line 20, after the figures "\$588" and the semicolon add the following: "International Labor Organization \$163,511.64, including not to exceed \$5,901 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the meetings of the general conference and of the governing body of the International Labor Office and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent, traveling expenses, purchase of books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and charts, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, hire, maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such other expenses as may be necessary."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it contains items that are not included in authorizations of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment I have proposed follows the purpose of the act of June 19, 1934, which provides as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization, which, through its general conference of representatives of its members and through its International Labor Office, collects information concerning labor throughout the world and prepares international conventions for the consideration of member governments with a view to improving conditions of labor.

The powers included in the proposal are all necessary and incident to the authority granted by the act referred to. Our membership in the organization cannot be properly accomplished except under the authority conveyed by that language.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any authorization for entertainment in the act to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. CALDWELL. I believe it is perfectly obvious, Mr. Chairman, that entertainment is a necessary incident to the carrying out of the purposes of the act. Considering the objective desired to be attained and the purpose of the passage of the legislation, I think it must be admitted that

our participation in the conference cannot be successful without it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to give a liberal interpretation to the act referred to by the gentleman from Florida, but within such a liberal interpretation the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order on the ground that an appropriation for such a purpose is not authorized.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer the amendment with the word "entertainment" stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 20, line 20, after the figures and semicolon insert the following: "International Labor Organization \$163,511.64, including not to exceed \$5,901 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the meetings of the general conference and of the governing body of the International Labor Office and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent, traveling expenses, purchase of books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and charts, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such other expenses as may be necessary."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order with respect to other language in the amendment, such as the words "as may be necessary."

I make the point of order for the further reason that the language "and in such regional, industrial, or other special meetings as may be duly called by such governing body, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent, newspapers, and so forth," goes beyond the scope of what is implied in taking membership in an international body. The recitation of all these specific terms is of itself evidence that there is an attempt here to set up authority for certain specific expenses that are not included in the language of the original legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman from South Dakota is making too liberal an interpretation of the act, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk a further amendment. This takes the place of the language stricken on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: On page 18, line 2, after the figures and the semicolon insert the following: "Bureau of Interparliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration, \$20,000, including not to exceed \$10,000 for the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, maps, stationery, official cards, printing and binding, entertainment, and other necessary expenses to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language is still beyond the authorization of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman be specific and point out the language he objects to in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. TABER. The words "and other necessary expenses to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe it proper, in view of the scope of the act which authorizes our participation in the Interparliamentary Union, that it be held that all of the purposes now included in the amendment are authorized. Even the word "entertainment," which was complained of in the point of order previously considered, must of necessity be included here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The act of June 28, 1935, among other things, in the second paragraph has the following language:

Such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the president and the executive secretary of the American group.

Considering this language in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered simply does what has been done for several years by providing the money for the participation by the American group in the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is unnecessary for me to take more of the time of the Committee in discussing this matter.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the operations of this Interparliamentary Union do not serve a good purpose. I am satisfied we will get along better in our diplomatic relations with other people if we do not participate in this organization. Some of the members who attended the meeting last summer reported that they left before the proposition was over, and that they felt that the convention might better not have been held. I am satisfied that this kind of a gathering tends to interfere with regular and normal intercourse with respect to foreign affairs with other countries by setting up a group other than the State Department to have charge of our foreign matters. I think such a practice is bad, and I think it ought to be discontinued. I therefore hope the Committee will decide to save \$20,000 and throw this thing out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

WATERWAYS TREATY, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN: INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses, including salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of the United States, with the approval solely of the Secretary of State; for necessary traveling expenses, and for expenses incident to holding hearings and conferences at such places in Canada and the United States as shall be determined by the Commission or by the American Commissioners to be necessary, including traveling expense and compensation of necessary witnesses, making necessary transcript of testimony and proceedings; for cost of lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, office equipment and supplies; and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the International Joint Commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada, and for other purposes, signed January 11, 1909; \$19,500, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That the Commissioners on the part of the United States shall serve in that capacity without additional compensation: *Provided further*, That traveling expenses of the American Commissioners, secretary, and necessary employees shall be allowed in accordance with the provisions of the Subsidence Expense Act of 1926, as amended (I. U. S. C. 821-833).

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: On page 28, line 10, in the parentheses, strike out the letter "I" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "5".

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is merely to correct a typographical error.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: Secretary of Commerce, Under Secretary of Commerce, Assistant Secretary, and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including the Chief Clerk and Superintendent, who shall be chief executive officer of the Department and who may be designated by the Secretary of Commerce to sign minor routine official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary of the Department, \$546,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary of Commerce for personal services of experts and specialists

at rates of compensation not in excess of \$9,000 per annum without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso beginning in line 23, of page 32, and ending in line 3, on page 35, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the point of order is to the language beginning in line 23, of page 32, beginning with the word "Provided"?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: On page 32, beginning in line 23, strike out "\$546,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$384,500."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I say that when the \$100,000 item goes out on a point of order, it follows that the \$60,000 item involved in this paragraph for clerical hire also ought to go out along with it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For all printing and binding for the Department of Commerce, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, except the Patent Office and the Bureau of the Census, \$328,000: *Provided*, That an amount not to exceed \$2,000 of this appropriation may be expended for salaries of persons detailed from the Government Printing Office for service as copy editors.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 35, after line 3, insert a separate head as follows:

"BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of taking, compiling, and publishing the Sixteenth Census of the United States, as authorized by the act of June 18, 1929 (13 U. S. C. 201-218), and the national census of housing as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1406), and for carrying on other authorized census work, within a limit of cost for the period of July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1942, of \$53,250,000, including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the cost of transcribing State, municipal, and other records; contracts for the preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character which cannot be accomplished through ordinary employment; per diem compensation of employees of the Department of Commerce and other departments and independent establishments of the Government who may be detailed for field work; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the collection of statistics, when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Commerce; purchase of books of reference, periodicals, maps, newspapers, manuscripts, first-aid outfits for use in the buildings occupied by employees of the census; maintenance, operation, and repair of a passenger-carrying automobile to be used on official business; construction, purchase, exchange, or rental of punching, tabulating, sorting, and other labor-saving machines, including technical, mechanical, and other services in connection therewith; printing and binding, traveling expenses, streetcar fares, and all other contingent expenses in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$17,850,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be available immediately, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this title in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1940, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1941.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 37, beginning with the word "within", on line 17, running through the word "elsewhere", in line 20. It is legislation on an appropriation bill, increasing the limitation that now exists against the expenses of the Census Bureau, and it is unauthorized by law.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman state the particular language to which he makes the point of order?

Mr. TABER. I shall read it. It is as follows, beginning on line 17, page 37:

Within a limit of cost for the period of July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1942, of \$53,250,000, including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order is well taken. It is simply an economy measure that the committee wrote in.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is not an economy measure. It raises the authorization \$150,000 beyond all authorizations now existing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, before that is done, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did I understand the point of order was directed to the language—

Within a limit of cost for the period of July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1942, of \$53,250,000—

The CHAIRMAN. Also the additional language—

including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the matter be reconsidered. I did not hear the reading of the language last referred to. The language "including personal services and rentals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere" is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair that might not be so, but the gentleman from New York made the point of order against the entire language, and consequently it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Then I desire to propose an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have that privilege after the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York has been disposed of. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 38, line 16, strike out "\$17,850,000" and insert "\$15,684,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is made to save \$2,166,000, which is the cost of the so-called housing census for the fiscal year 1941. That housing census is described in the hearings of the committee on pages 80, 81, 82, and part of 83. A great lot of that matter is duplication. The people of the country are up in arms against this proposal. We are getting letters by the hundreds in our office against this proposition. These census enumerators will want to know whether one has a bathtub or a shower bath, and whether you have running water within the dwelling unit or a hand pump—whether your water supply comes from more than 50 feet from the house or is within 50 feet of the house. They want to know amongst other things whether you have a toilet, whether it is a flush toilet or chemical nonflush toilet or an outside toilet or privy, and whether there is no toilet or privy. They want to know what kind of lights you have. There are about 33 major questions with an (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) on each one. It is more of a job than the whole census. It is the most ridiculous thing that was ever put up to the American people. The whole cost of this proposition will be \$8,000,000 on top of the regular census cost and it is time that the Congress got together and saved \$8,000,000 of fooling money away to get nowhere. There is hardly an item that might be of any value described in this entire schedule that is not covered by the regular census. We cannot afford to go on with this kind of business. We ought to stop spending in this way, in this ill-considered way, and save a little money.

It is time that we set our heads in the direction of balancing the Budget, instead of running wild and following every scheme that the bureaucrats can evolve to spend money. The census enumerator already has a white sheet a yard long on which he has to ask questions with reference to every member of the household, and he has to give a pretty good description of the house. In addition to this, they propose to give him this proposition with 33 questions and 7 or 8 subdivisions under each of the 33 questions. He will be an hour and a half with each person that he interviews, and we will never get to the end of the annoyance you and I will be put to by our constituents if we allow this outrage to be perpetrated and let them go on and spend \$8,000,000 for that performance.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Is it the gentleman's purpose to strike out the whole appropriation for the housing census?

Mr. TABER. The whole \$2,166,000 for the housing census.

Mr. HARE. I understood the gentleman to say that the housing census would cost \$8,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It will cost \$8,000,000. That is an estimate before the deficiency committee now for the balance of the \$8,000,000 which they want to spend in the fiscal year 1940, between now and July 1. If we strike out this \$2,166,000, we will probably not have to bother with striking out the other item.

Now let us start in the right direction and get rid of this \$2,166,000 and not fool away money.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that the figures are \$5,125,000 for the deficiency and \$2,166,000 in this bill, leaving about \$700,000 short of \$8,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is that he did not begin soon enough to prevent this appropriation. The latter part of last session an act was passed by this Congress and approved by the President authorizing the taking of the housing census. It is contemplated to take that along in connection with the regular decennial census which is being taken. In other words, in this bill we are appropriating \$2,166,000 for the purpose of taking this census which has been authorized and approved by the Congress. If we do it with the machinery that we have now, we can take the housing census at about one-fourth or one-fifth the cost that would be necessary if we did it independently and had to have a new set-up to take this census.

The principal objection of the gentleman from New York is that it asks too many questions of the party who is being interrogated. I agree with the gentleman that if we had to make up that questionnaire we would not put so many questions in it. We would make it simpler and ask fewer questions. But this proposition is simply to appropriate \$2,166,000 to take this census while we are taking the general Sixteenth Census of this country. Not to do it now, I repeat, would cost us four or five times more than the cost would be if we waited until some other time to take the census.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask a question for information. This has been bothering me for some time. Do those who are engaged in taking the census come under the Hatch Act or not?

Mr. KERR. Well, I imagine they do. They are employees of the Government. That is simply an opinion of mine.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Attorney General has sent an opinion to every census supervisor that has been appointed to the effect that it does apply.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman and his committee is not responsible for the taking of the housing census?

Mr. KERR. Not at all. The Congress is responsible for it.

Mr. HARE. The only thing the gentleman has done is to provide money which was authorized by the Congress in the last session?

Mr. KERR. Yes, and following the good judgment of those who appeared before us, the paramount reasons are not only to get this information which would enlighten us in the development of our housing program, but now is the proper time to obtain this data through the organization which is now set up and functioning in the Census Bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter in which I am deeply interested. I believe there is a very grave misunderstanding in regard to the legislation which was passed last August. You will recall that the housing bill itself was defeated by this Congress. The census-of-housing bill was predicated upon the passage of the housing bill. The necessity for taking this census has already passed. The Census of Housing Act was comparatively simple, and you can find in it nowhere any intent or contemplation on the part of Congress to carry an impertinent inquiry into the private affairs of the homes of this country—30,000,000 homes.

I will say to you that no proposal that has been made in this country within a decade except the court-packing fight has aroused such resistance and opposition as this Housing Census Act has aroused among the American people. They resent this prying and snooping into their private affairs disclosed by the last few questions. Let me enumerate some of them:

VII. For each owner-occupied nonfarm dwelling unit:

In structures without business containing not more than four dwelling units.

28. Market value of this property:

a. Owner-occupant's estimate of the market value of this property.

b. Number of dwelling units included in this value.

29. Is there a mortgage (or land contract) on this property?

Items 30 to 33 need be enumerated only when "Yes" is entered in item 29.

30. Present amount of outstanding indebtedness:

a. On first mortgage or land contract.

b. On second mortgage and other junior liens.

31. Regular payments required on this first mortgage or land contract:

a. Frequency and amount of regular payments, including interest.

(Enter amount in 1, 2, 3, or 4; or "X" in 5 or 6.)

(1) Monthly payments of.

(2) Quarterly payments of.

(3) Semiannual payments of.

(4) Annual payments of.

(5) Other regular-payment plan.

(6) No regular payments required.

b. Do these payments include an amount for reduction of principal?

c. Do these payments include real-estate taxes?

32. What interest rate is now charged on this first mortgage or land contract?

33. Who holds this first mortgage or land contract?

a. Building and loan association.

b. Commercial bank or trust company.

c. Savings bank (mutual or stock).

d. Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

e. Life-insurance company.

f. Mortgage company.

g. Individual.

h. Other.

I have a profound respect for the Census Bureau. It has existed for 150 years. I say to you without fear of any contradiction from any of those men who have been connected with the Census Bureau that they never desired to ask the questions which appear at the latter part of the inquiries which have been sent out, which will be asked by the politically local census enumerators of the head of every household.

The regular officials of the Census Bureau did not want to include the objectionable questions, but from some source somewhere pressure was brought to bear to put in those intimate inquiries, and the people resent them. What is more, citizens are under the threat of jail sentence and fine if they fail to answer these questions and answer them truthfully.

I repeat that never since the Court fight have I been so deluged with mail as I have on this census-of-housing bill. I say to you that for the sake of preserving respect for, and the good name of, the Census Bureau this Congress itself should resist this attempt on the part of some undisclosed influence to use the Census Bureau as a snooping agency under cover of this Census of Housing Act. This House of Representatives is where we shall have to begin to stop this invasion of personal liberty. Of late there has been a tendency on the part of the departments to so construe acts of Congress as to misrepresent to the American people the real intent of Congress. Had there been read to the Congress of the United States the questions set forth in this proposed questionnaire the housing-census bill never would have passed. I hope now that you will strike out this item. Already a resolution, so I am told, has been introduced in the Senate to stop the asking of these obnoxious questions under this census-of-housing bill. Let us do our part to stop it here. I have introduced a bill to repeal this obnoxious legislation which if not repealed will cost \$8,000,000 to accomplish no good purpose, aid no function of government; but which, if administered, will serve only as an irritant to the law-abiding people who still believe they have some rights of privacy in their homes and protection for their intimately personal affairs.

I appeal to you for the preservation of the good name of Congress, for the protection of the good name of the Census Bureau itself, to vote to strike out this item right here and now and help with your votes to eventually repeal the whole Census of Housing Act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The questions were prepared by the Director of the Census. Why does the gentleman say he was not in favor of them?

Mr. REED of New York. They are assigned to him as author, but he did not prepare them.

The asking of these questions can serve no useful purpose. It should not be carried through. These inquisitorial questions ought never to have been included and never were intended by the framers of the bill.

Mr. KERR. How did they get there if not through the officials who prepared the forms?

Mr. REED of New York. They were prepared by a board. They were ordered to include them. I am talking about the Census Bureau, not about the Department of Commerce.

Mr. KERR. Who ordered the Census Bureau to put them in there?

Mr. REED of New York. I do not know who ordered them; and, of course, I would not ask them to tell. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to excerpts from letters received from all parts of the country protesting against un-American census-of-housing program.

While I have received many protests from men in all walks of life complaining that they must, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, or both, reveal to a local census enumerator the amount of their income and other personal matters never before asked in a census, I shall first quote a few protests from women, for, after all, they have to answer these questions in the great majority of cases. One woman wrote to me as follows:

I, for one—and I believe there will be many, many thousands like me—would be very reluctant to answer these absurd and intimate questions.

Another:

This snooping into private affairs is, plainly putting it, nonsense, and should be stopped.

Another:

This is a free country. Let's keep it that way.

Another:

The New Dealers are certainly taking away our American liberties, and must be curbed now.

Another:

It is unfair for people to have to make all of their affairs public, and we have plenty of taxes now without adding another \$8,000,000 to our present debt.

Another:

I beg of you to do what you can in regard to eliminating that part of the new census bill in which, under penalty of fines and jail sentences, we have to bare our very souls. When our country sinks to this degradation it is a sorry state, indeed.

Another:

Americans are still intelligent; and if the law is not changed, everyone should refuse to answer objectionable questions, taking a fine or jail sentence, if necessary, until we get results.

Another:

I sincerely believe that you have the support of every intelligent citizen of this country in your efforts to have the present census law amended and modified so that our most private affairs will not be subject to the consideration, discussion, and exploitation by any party to whom they are made available.

It is time the American people began to pay attention to what is taking place in our governmental organization before it is put upon an entirely dictatorial basis.

Another:

The April census, as the bill now stands, is an insult to every intelligent man or woman in this community. I have no objections to a Government census as conducted in the past, but I do object to this regimentation this New Deal is forcing on everyone. Before this country is entirely communistic, it is high time we take a stand. I will refuse to answer any personal questions asked by the New Deal snooper.

Another:

I frankly think the Government is stepping on the people's personal rights, and I hope that you will do all within your power to protect these rights for the people whom you represent in Congress.

Another:

You have our hearty commendation for the stand you are taking on the census. More power to you! It is a fine thing when the Government feels it has a right to pry and snoop into the affairs of a private citizen to this extent! We have always regarded it our inalienable right to conduct our affairs without such unwarranted prying, and hope you will continue to do all you can to get this matter rescinded at once. This is surely going too far.

Another:

I do object to local enumerators being given the right to question us in regards to our wages or salary or other domestic affairs of our household.

Another woman:

I object to local enumerators being given the power to do this unnecessary and unwarranted snooping.

Another:

I trust that you will not rest till the whole matter is brought before the people and the party or parties who framed these snooping questions are made known and their names held up to the contempt they deserve.

Another:

We do not care to tell all of our "personal affairs" to some local enumerator. We do not feel it is just to either fine or give us a prison sentence if we do not disclose our affairs to them.

Another:

We Americans will not stand to have our constitutional rights thrown away in this manner. And we will prove what we say next November.

Another:

Do we or don't we as American citizens have some right to our personal affairs? Or is this country of ours becoming one of a dictatorship?

Another:

Many citizens with whom I have talked strenuously disapprove of governmental snooping into their domestic affairs.

Another:

This is supposed to be a free country, but it is far from it if you have got to tell the Government through some local census taker all your personal matters. That's going too far. Stop it, for the sake of all of us.

Another:

It injures my pride in Americanism and my faith in the ability of the leaders of this country to preserve and protect our greatest rights of liberty. I don't like to feel regimented, that I am being treated as they do in foreign countries, where a human being is not an individual any more, but how can I feel otherwise? I was taught the American creed of love, honor, and respect for freedom and liberty that is so typically American. How am I going to teach that to others when someone comes along and takes away the very privacy of my life?

Another:

The insolence of the proposed questions surpasses belief, delving, as they do, into the most intimate phase of home life and financial arrangements of the family.

Another:

It is the most un-American of any ruling yet imposed upon the people by what is supposed to be a democratic government. A very sad fact about this is that few people know about it.

Another:

I think a person should be allowed a few private thoughts and business without advertising it to the community.

Another:

I, being a taxpayer in New York State, am very much opposed to the forthcoming census, being compelled by law to give all of my personal affairs.

Another:

As an American citizen I object to our Government forcing me, under threat of fine or jail term, to disclose my private affairs, even my salary or wages, to a local census enumerator. This country has always been free and we want to keep it free. We do not want a dictator in America.

Another:

It would seem we are no longer a democracy and that our personal liberty is at stake.

Another:

It is an outrageous piece of New Deal totalitarianism. It invades the individual's personal and private rights and that of the family life. I protest against this meddlesome snooping.

Another woman:

It is a snooping campaign that all to whom I have talked are denouncing bitterly. It may not be "search" in the actual fact of invasion of our homes, but it is certainly search of our private affairs, which is just as objectionable to men and women to whom freedom is the breath of life.

Referring to the legal requirement that the census answers be kept confidential, one newspaper editor remarks:

One can only say, "maybe," to that. How did John L. Lewis get confidential coal-cost data, for example?

Another editor said:

The chances are the political hack who pries into your affairs will have a great deal to gossip about. It is too much to expect all of the thousands so hastily recruited will be above that temptation.

Referring to the many letters to the editor, another editorial says:

It can be described, perhaps, as intensified realization that—almost without knowing it—the American people, under the guise of liberal reforms, are being regimented as completely as if they were living under the tightest of dictatorships.

Speaking of dictatorships, here is what one man wrote to me:

Russia and Germany are sure laughing at us. If people are going to land in jail Congress better pass a bill for more Federal jails.

Another man:

Try and repeal this thing, otherwise when the time comes you are going to find the best people in the country in trouble.

Another:

It tastes too much like dictatorship to me,

Another:

My people have fought in every war from the Revolution to the World War, and if this Government is going to take those rights away from us, by dictatorship methods as this census shows, then I and the many people around me who think the same, will have to go back to those methods our forefathers took with England.

A petition:

We, as citizens of a democratic country, feel that that the 1940 census will be a violation of our civil liberties. It promises to be a repulsive snooping into our private lives and affairs, a definite step toward Government regimentation. If the people of Germany and Russia want that sort of thing, let them have it; we don't want it.

Another man:

I am writing you to tell you how bitterly opposed I am to the housing census or this prying and snooping into private affairs. We are coming to dictatorship fast enough unless we all do what we can to prevent it.

A petition:

This is out of place in a free country which is not yet supposed to be ruled by a dictator.

From a man and wife:

If this type of law is allowed to stand we will soon be in a class with Russia—if we are not already there.

From a woman:

Let us have the freedom and rights of Americans.

A man:

I am opposed to the United States of America adopting Russian policies in putting across this census snooping.

From a woman:

It is an outrage that our administration should even contemplate such unfairness, much less to enforce it. What have our forefathers given up their lives for, to adopt Russia's form of liberty?

From a man and wife:

Let them have regimentation in Germany and Russia if that's what they want; we don't want it here.

A FEW PROTESTS FROM MEN

I never heard of or knew that the President, a bureau, the New Deal, or even Congress, could change the United States Constitution. I supposed that had to be done by the people.

Another man:

It seems to me that there is so little of the old American rights left, and from what I can gather this census taking will leave us without a private or sacred thought of our own.

Another:

The majority of American citizens have never failed their Government when necessity arrived, and never will, but the act of spreading before your neighbors all your private business is not a governmental function.

Another:

I have nothing to be ashamed of in my private affairs, but, nevertheless, I feel that when I must tell all—or else—that things have gone way too far. Everyone I have spoken to about this feels the same, except the local enumerator, and he is a ward heeler whom I would not trust to keep the affairs of others confidential.

Another:

I would like to see throughout our country such a storm wave of protests against this recent Government snooping that it will have to be repealed.

Another:

To my layman mind the plan seems an invasion of the liberties guaranteed in spirit by our Bill of Rights. Public distaste for the census as proposed will develop into resentment as enumerators press their questions. The people being questioned will not be cooperative and the resulting information may be incomplete and misleading to a large degree. Under such circumstances data obtained by this census cannot be worth the cost.

Another:

I feel that the Government has no right to pry and snoop into the personal affairs of a private American citizen and that it violates the personal security of the Constitution.

Another man:

This is about the last straw from a bunch of scatterbrained New Deal dictators.

Another:

I resent it very deeply and consider it an encroachment upon the rights of the people of the Nation.

Another:

We think it is an outrage for a local enumerator to be empowered to pry into one's private affairs.

Another:

I, for one, resent what may be a step in taking away our personal liberty.

Another:

I object to our Government forcing us, under threat of fine or imprisonment, to disclose our salary or wages to a local enumerator.

Another:

If the heads of the administration want to become dictators, why can't we ship them all to Europe and let them go to it? Whole communities will go to jail before they will allow this snooping into their business.

Another:

It is more than snooping; it is depriving us of our constitutional rights.

Another:

We have felt the injustices of the Government snooping into everything. It is not for the good of the people that all this information is demanded.

Another:

I do not intend to answer questions which are none of their business.

PETITIONS

Among the petitions which I have received is one signed by 626 out of 700 employees of one company in my district. Following are excerpts from that petition:

In the first place, we do not believe that a resident of this locality should be appointed to snoop into our personal affairs. This would be unbearable, especially in a small community, and a good many would evade correct answers, chancing a fine.

What if we did not pay as much for our home as our next-door neighbor, or have put a mortgage on it for personal reasons—should this information become public gossip?

Another petition bearing 84 names:

We feel that this census is un-American and is only paving the way to future dictatorship.

Another petition bearing 50 names:

We feel that the census as hitherto taken should be sufficient and will back you in any way possible in what you may do to stop these meddling questions.

Another petition, 156 names:

We, as taxpayers and citizens, offer our objections to the enumerators being given the right to question us as to our earnings and other domestic affairs.

A petition of 18:

We wish to express our approval of your efforts to effect repeal of the Special Census Act.

Petition of 15:

We designate you to do all in your power to take such necessary action that will repeal this bill.

Petition of 20 persons:

We object to being forced to disclose our private affairs.

Another petition of 71 signers voices this same objection.

Following are expressions of smaller groups which assembled in homes, stores, and other places:

Those in power in Washington seem to be trying as far as they dare to emulate Hitler and Stalin. This always has been a free and wonderful country, but for some time now it seems that the Government has been usurping more and more authority and has plunged the country into debt so deep it may never find its way out, and they still want to go in deeper.

Words are inadequate to express our feelings of disgust and revolt at the thought of being required to answer questions of so private a nature.

It runs counter to every tradition of our free American lives and violates directly the personal security guaranties of the Constitution itself.

All we ask is consideration and justice. No born American wants to divulge his personal affairs to the public.

A population count is necessary, but when it comes to snooping into all particulars of one's personal affairs it is most emphatically resented.

The Daughters of Union Veterans of one town wrote:

We feel that our Grand Old Army fought for freedom and we aim to maintain that blessed freedom they obtained, so kindly do what you can to repeal the special census of housing supposed to begin on April 1.

From Veterans of Foreign Wars, Tezzi-Reitz Post, No. 250, Philadelphia, Pa.:

I brought before the members of the above-captioned post the snooping attitude and the un-American methods of prying into the personal affairs of the citizens of this country by a group of political hacks who may use the information obtained for a mercenary cause and which might cause considerable embarrassment to many of our citizens. The members of this post agree with you that the present bill should be repealed and will give you whole-hearted support in your efforts to have it changed.

From an American Legion auxiliary:

The Legion auxiliary of the George Harbel Post want to join in protesting the housing census.

From a teacher of sociology in a monastery:

Laissez faire was a bad feature of individualism but national social planning can also be carried too far. Yea, even to the extent of being snoopy. And so I wish to add my voice to you in protest against certain practices of the National Census Bureau of 1940.

From a minister:

I desire to express my appreciation of your action in introducing a bill in the House concerning unnecessary and inquisitive questions in the forthcoming census.

From the head of a parochial school:

It is our sincere prayer that your bill to repeal the housing census may meet with the approval of every true American.

From a Sunday-school class—20 signers:

We vigorously object to this so-called government snooping census. As a free people we object to being regimented.

From a school faculty:

We congratulate you for position taken on census matter.

A college professor:

It looks to me as if the census is to be used as a means of getting information concerning the financial affairs of citizens which would be used as a basis for a capital levy if the present administration is retained in power or one like it elected. At the very least it will be used as a means of imposing additional local taxation upon citizens.

From a store owner:

I am just a small-store owner, but as another American, I refuse to answer the questions put to me by some political appointee.

A physician:

We do not approve of the personal clause in the census.

A businessman:

Public opinion, as I have heard it expressed in no uncertain terms, is decidedly against the personal-affairs phase of the census.

A surgeon:

I know of nothing that enrages an American any more than to have some young upstart come poking into your home to ask you how many bathrooms you have, how many windows you have, what kind of rugs on the floor, what make of kitchen stove, and a thousand other senseless questions.

An oil producer:

It seems to me that no one will seriously object to furnishing the enumerators with any kind of useful or necessary statistical information, but when it comes to incomes, etc., then it becomes just as objectionable as a previous law to make income-tax returns public documents and which, due to an aroused public sentiment, had to be thrown out the window. This is especially objectionable in view of the fact that the enumerators are, I understand, to be local residents.

A lawyer:

This is certainly a crazy scheme to spend a lot more of the people's money.

A farmer:

Let me commend you highly for introducing a bill to allow us to maintain some of the liberties to which we were once accustomed. I had made up my mind to let the census taker guess on some of the questions and have not changed it yet.

Officers and employees of a corporation:

While we agree that there is certain information to which the Government is justly entitled and should have free access to this information, there is other information requested in this new census which smacks of totalitarianism and deprives us of the privacy to which we are justly entitled.

A businessman:

We not only think this will impose on what are our own personal affairs but also a big waste of money.

President of a metal company:

The administration pretends to admire Thomas Jefferson, but acts the opposite way. It forgets that in the Declaration of Independence he put something like this: "He (King George III) has erected a multitude of new offices and sent among us swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." It does exactly the same things.

President of a bank:

One of our women customers, who has a savings account, was in yesterday and appeared to be concerned lest the census taker would be asking how much she had in the bank, and if that question was required to be asked she proposed to draw her money out until after the census was taken.

It seems to be very unfortunate that the census could not have been taken in the usual fair and dignified manner.

Officers and employees of a bank, 29 signers:

There is a great deal of sentiment here in opposition to the questions of a very personal nature, answers to which, we understand, will be required.

A businessman:

I consider this census an invasion of my personal rights, and as a taxpayer to the extent of over \$3,000 a year want to say that the millions spent in this project are a waste of money which could be used to far better advantage than to increase our already huge debt.

Another businessman:

I regard it as the duty of every American citizen to work toward the abolition of this attempt to regiment the country, and if this is not a free country I would certainly appreciate knowing it. I have numerous acquaintances who have expressed themselves as decidedly against the census in the form that it is proposed to take. We all consider this inquisitorial idea a distinct violation of our rights as American citizens and intend to resist such encroachment vigorously.

Another:

This new New Deal act is another step toward Hitlerism and, if not stopped, will lead to further aggressions on our personal liberties.

Another:

We think it is a disgrace and an insult to be subjected to such a humiliation as the census-taking law. Just what can we expect next? We—and I speak for a good many people in our community—simply cannot tolerate such an infringement on our freedom, or aren't we supposed to have it any more?

Another:

This census is an outrage on the people and, of course, the questions have been added by someone wanting to have an authority over the rights of the people.

Another:

For the last 8 years I have been trying to operate a small business. To put a climax on the rapidly increasing taxes, reports, etc., we now find that the Government is even going deeper into our personal affairs in taking the 1940 census. The sentiment toward the 1940 census is universal. There will be some well-filled jails. At least, the Government will have to take care of us for a change.

A real-estate broker:

We feel this is most un-American and one of the first steps toward regimentation—a system which many European countries suffer under at the present time. We find nothing contrary to this feeling in talking with the people of this section and feel that this is the general attitude of the community.

From the owner of a granite company:

I really didn't think that the new dealers would dare set aside what's left of the people's constitutional rights, but after draining our Treasury they have become snoopers with plans, no doubt, to drain the individual's pocket.

From a dentist:

I believe everyone in your district would appreciate it if you would do all in your power to have the census questions revised so as to eliminate a lot of the objectionable features. I need not go into any detail about this, as anybody who is informed on the matter knows that the procedure is outrageous.

From a farmer's wife:

In 5 years my taxes for schools were raised from \$12.49 to \$22.18, my State and county taxes from \$18 to \$31.18. So, if they send these people around, there will be that much more. If they want money, why not get out with a pick and shovel and earn it.

From a man and wife:

We have been acting as adults for too many years to feel that we need a paternal Government to look into our affairs in such detail as this census proposes to do.

Self-respect is still one of the fundamentals that will save the American form of government if people are not forced to lose it.

Another:

We have no objections to a population census, but believe that the \$8,000,000 could be used to better advantage by a Government already deep in the red.

Another:

The new census is one of the most discreditable steps ever taken by a democratic government. It is unbelievable.

Another:

We are opposed to this special census and the accompanying expense. Let's not pass the debt on to the next fellow but assume our full share in an economy that will reduce the load.

Mr. Chairman, these protests come from law-abiding American citizens and their views are worthy of the attention of their Representatives.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are probably several good reasons why this \$2,000,000 ought not to be allowed, but all of these reasons existed less than a year ago when this act passed the House without a record vote.

It is rather amusing to see the Committee on Appropriations criticized on the one hand because they refuse to allow items to carry out the purposes of legislation approved by the Congress and on the other to be criticized for allowing funds to effectuate the purposes of such acts.

The real reason behind the opposition to this is quite natural and one we can understand—a political reason. I do not believe you need go very deeply to find what prompts the motion.

The wisdom of whether or not these housing questions should be asked is one which was decided by the Advisory Committee on the Census. I think the information sought will probably serve a useful purpose, but whether this be so or not the machinery has been set up, the forms have been printed, the census officials have been instructed to secure the data. I feel this is not the time to stop the appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The Director of the Census has said that not a single step has been taken, outside of the Census Bureau's getting these blanks together, to go ahead and spend money on this thing.

Mr. CALDWELL. And I may say to the gentleman from New York that I think the Director of the Census is in error, because in the State of Florida I have seen forms relating to this particular census, and the officials of the census have their instructions.

Mr. TABER. Then the gentleman did not tell us the story when he was in front of us? Is that it?

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman may draw his own conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 79 of the hearings. This reviews the situation. I read this portion of the hearings to you:

Let us review first the history of the Housing Census Act. It originated in the Senate at the last session of Congress, after considerable urging by Senator WAGNER and others for legislation which would permit the Bureau of the Census to take a census of housing.

In a bill which was prepared several years ago, but was not presented for enactment by the administration, the subject of housing was added by the Federal Government to the subjects to be taken in the decennial census by the Census Bureau. At that time it received the approval of the administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator WAGNER introduced the present legislation April 5, 1939 (S. 2240, 76th Cong.). The Committee on Banking and Currency, to which it was referred, reported favorably, and it passed the Senate on June 23. The Census Committee reported it with amendments on July 26, and the Rules Committee recommended a special rule (H. Res. 281) on July 29. Both the rule and the bill were debated in the House on August 4, and the bill passed by a vote of 191 to 145.

The housing statistics which will be obtained under this authorization are needed both by the Government and by business. Such a census has been taken by the principal European countries for many years. England took her first census of housing in 1802, and has compiled very valuable and useful statistics.

We feel that it is a proper function of the Department of Commerce to gather these statistics for the use of other departments, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, the United States Housing Authority, and other governmental agencies interested in housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CALDWELL) there were—ayes 54, noes 52.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CALDWELL and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 59, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read down to line 10, page 52.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAYBURN, having resumed the chair, Mr. BEAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8319) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and for the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their own remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain census questions together with a few excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on the improved employment conditions in Connecticut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Evening Star and a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted at a meeting in Chicago protesting against certain operations in Poland and in Czechoslovakia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the junior Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD, at the laying of the keel of the U. S. S. *Alabama*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made over the N. B. C. last evening by the Honorable Leon C. Phillips, Governor of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 628)

The Chair laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to amend section 26 (e) of the act of February 23, 1931, as amended by the act of April 24, 1939, the purpose of which is to insert additional language which has been found, in administering the aforesaid section 26 (e) as now established, to be necessary in order to carry out fully the purposes of this law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1940.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, over a period of some little time the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], has been contributing articles to Liberty magazine. During a period when there is no committee in existence he, of course, has a perfect right to write articles or to say anything that he pleases, as has every other American citizen. I suppose all of us have that right as a general matter, but no member of this committee can dissociate himself from the committee in the public mind. At the present time, moreover,

the committee is functioning, and one of the things that it has been stated the committee would undertake is an investigation of matters on the west coast and in California.

I will be glad to get to the bottom of any difficulties that there may be in my own State as well as in any other State, but in the current issue of *Liberty* magazine is an article written by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities with reference to the situation in California. The committee very properly, I think, did not make public the report of the investigators on the west-coast matters for the reason that no hearings had yet been held regarding them. I do not propose to address myself to the substance of that article or to what is stated therein, but it appears to me that inevitably the very appearance of such an article and the expressions in that article of the chairman's point of view as to what he thinks about the situation puts the investigation in an extremely difficult situation, and makes it very hard for the course of the investigation not to be colored by opinions and statements already made and matter more or less of record.

There is at issue here the whole question of proper conduct of an investigation and therefore of the work of the committee, about which I have spoken before. It seems to me the job of the committee is to take evidence, establish facts in its hearings and through its investigation, and thereafter make a report. The time for appraisals of any situation seems to me to be after, not before, all the evidence and testimony are in. I would not be true to my own convictions about this matter if I did not protest what has happened.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. NORTON, for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. BLOOM (at the request of Mr. Izac), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MITCHELL, for 4 days, on account of illness in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The Speaker pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1157. An act for the relief of Roy D. Cook, a minor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting on Thursday, February 8, 1940, at 10 a. m., before the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. State regulatory bodies will be heard first.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Tuesday, February 13, 1940:

H. R. 1780, to amend section 7 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. III, title 46, sec. 319), relative to penalties on certain undocumented vessels and cargoes engaging in the coastwise trade or the fisheries, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5837, to amend section 221 of the Shipping Act, barring certain aliens from participating in the benefits thereof.

H. R. 6770, to amend Revised Statutes 4311 (U. S. C. 251).

H. R. 7694, to amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

H. R. 8180, to require that not less than 75 percent of the crew of any fishing vessel of the United States be citizens of the United States.

Tuesday, February 20, 1940:

H. R. 4079, to amend sections 4353 and 4355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

H. R. 6751, to repeal certain laws with respect to manifests and vessel permits.

H. R. 5788, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collector of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

H. R. 5789, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collectors of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

Friday, February 23, 1940:

H. R. 7639, to provide for the examination of civilian nautical schools and for the inspection of vessels used in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 8016) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (municipal compositions). The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

Beginning Tuesday, February 27, 1940, the Committee on the Census will hold hearings on the reapportionment of Representatives in Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7926. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 1088. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exchange certain property located at Veterans' Administration facility, Tuskegee, Ala., title to which is now vested in the United States, for certain property of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute; without amendment (Rept. No. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 2866. An act to provide for allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for examination and treatment; without amendment (Rept. No. 1579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 2867. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., for right-of-way purposes, a small strip of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Coatesville, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8340) for the relief of Eugene E. Lee; and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 8348. A bill to maintain farm homes in the United States and provide power to consume goods and provide opportunity for the employment of the idle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 8349. A bill to amend section 272 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., par. 394) in relation to forbidding corporations and voluntary associations from practicing law before courts, quasi judicial or administrative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 8350. A bill permitting official mail of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau to be transmitted in penalty envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 8351. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8352. A bill adding section 41-A to the judicial code concerning the importation, transportation, and disposition of property acquired through confiscatory decrees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 8353. A bill to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 8354. A bill to provide for complaint, assistance to farmers, and intervention by the Secretary of Agriculture in proceedings before the United States Maritime Commission relating to the transportation of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 8355 (by request). A bill to provide greater uniformity of entitlement to, and adjudication of, certain benefits for certain classification of veterans, and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 8356. A bill for the exchange of lands adjacent to the San Juan National Forest and the Rio Grande National Forest in Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 8357. A bill to amend the act entitled "Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938"; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 8358. A bill for the protection of the American merchant marine, and other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUCE:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of Charles Moore; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution for the relief of the anguished, stricken, and starving population of war-torn and martyred Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 379. Resolution authorizing the printing of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8359. A bill for the relief of Thomas Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 8360. A bill granting a pension to Cuthbert W. Chesterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLUETT:

H. R. 8361. A bill granting an increase of pension to Georgiana Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS:

H. R. 8362. A bill for the relief of Istvan Gyergyai; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8363. A bill for the relief of Eugene Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 8364. A bill for the relief of Glenn Richard Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Utah:

H. R. 8365. A bill for the relief of Cooley Memorial Hospital, Murland W. Fish, M. D., Juanita B. Stone, and May Jeppson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 8366. A bill granting a pension to Katherine Mueller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6405. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Polish Relief Committee of Niagara Falls, N. Y., and resolution from the St. Francis Society branch of Polish Union of America, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring House Joint Resolution 412; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6406. By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan: Petition of Oscar J. Weisler, of East Jordan; Jake Klvester, of Ellsworth; and sundry others of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6407. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of sundry citizens of Kewanee, Ill., urging that shipment of war materials to Japan be stopped; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6408. By Mr. COLLINS: Concurrent resolution submitted by the Mississippi State Legislature, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide a way by which the counties of the State of Mississippi may be reimbursed by the Federal Government for losses of revenue because of Government-owned lands having been withdrawn from tax liability; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6409. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of 57 residents of Wichita, Kans., and vicinity, urging enactment of the Patman chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6410. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Brooklyn Concourse Association of Homing Pigeon Flyers, Middle Village, Long Island, N. Y., urging support of House bill 7813, a bill to guarantee protection to the valuable homing pigeon against hunters, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6411. Also, petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, Washington, D. C., concerning House bill 960; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6412. Also, petition of the Society of American Foresters, Oneonta, N. Y., urging increased Federal appropriation for the control of white-pine blister rust; also expressing opposition to the proposed transfer of the administration of the

national forests to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6413. Also, petition of Mary R. Dorsett and others, of New York City, urging support of the referendum before conscription for foreign wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6414. Also, petition of the Air Line Pilots Association, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of Senate bill 2735, providing for the issuance of pilot's license No. 1 to Orville Wright; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6415. Also, petition of the Pacific Northwest Business Association, Seattle, Wash., urging support of the four-point plan of Admiral Yarnell of the United States Navy (retired) for the settlement of the Far East situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6416. Also, petition of the Bureau of Transportation and Public Service of the New Bedford Board of Commerce, New Bedford, Mass., urging support of House Resolution 360, providing for an investigation of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Deep Waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6417. Also, petition of the Michigan Alkali Co., Detroit, Mich., urging support of House Resolution 360, providing for an investigation of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Deep Waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6418. Also, petition of the Valdez Chamber of Commerce, Valdez, Alaska, concerning the report of Harry J. Slattery, Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

6419. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of House bill 960; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6420. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Empire State Automobile Merchants Association, Inc., Albany, N. Y., concerning the Wagner National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

6421. Also, petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, favoring the passage of House bill 960, the Ramspeck bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6422. By Mr. RANKIN: Petition of the Legislature of Mississippi; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6423. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Concurrent resolution introduced and adopted by the House of Assembly and concurred in by the Senate of the State of New Jersey, January 15, 1940, memorializing the House of Representatives to continue the Dies committee investigating un-American practices, feeling that the work of this committee is vitally important to the protection and perpetuation of the spirit of true American patriotism; to the Committee on Rules.

6424. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution passed by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, setting forth the necessity for, and urging an increase in, the appropriation for Central Valley project for the next fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6425. Also, resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, requesting support of the California delegation in making available essential appropriation to effect early culmination of Central Valley project; to the Committee on Appropriations.